INDIA

A Journal for the Discussion of Indian Affairs.

REGISTERED FOR] [TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

No. 16. Vol. II.] JANUARY 16, 1891. [PRICE, PER COPY, 2d., or 4 as. YEARLY, POST FREE, 2/6, or 3 rs

CONTENTS:

THE DARK SIDE OF BRITISH RULE IN INDIA: An Open Letter to the Members of the House of Commons.
INDIA GROWING POORER AS THE DIRECT RESULT OF BRITISH ADMINISTRATION. THE INDIAN TRADE A RUINOUS TRADE TO THE INDIAN PEOPLE
POVERTY DEEPENING, MAKING A NORMAL YEAR NOW WORSE THAN A FAMINE YEAR TWELVE YEARS AGO.
ANALYSIS OF BRITISH INDIAN TRADE. NO MARGIN, AFTER BARE SUBSISTENCE, FOR SAVING.
SERIOUS BREACH OF FAITH BY LORD CROSS; TWO ACTS OF PARLIAMENT AND THE QUEEN'S PROCLAMATION (1858) SET ASIDE.
Pages 1 to 20, and 26 to 30

	PAGE.
ADVERTISEMENTS	39, 40
CORRESPONDENCE:	
Anomalies of the Anglo-Indian Law	30
The Term "Babu" as used in India and in England	39
CONGRESS, THE SIXTH ANNUAL SESSION OF:	
The Story as told in Reuter's Telegrams	31, 32
Social Reform Interlude, A	31
Times Calcutta Correspondent's Telegrams	32
Comments of the Press	33-38
FAMINE-STRICKEN DISTRICT IN EASTERN BENGAL, A	25
LEADING ARTICLES:	
The "Bleeding White" of India	21
What is the Real Condition of India? Startling Official Facts	23
Congress at Calcutta, The	24
Indian Financial Year, The	24
Letter to Members of Parliament: A Needed Explanation	24
SALT TAX IN INDIA, THE:	
An Almost Incredible Prosecution of Two Women	25
PETITIONS TO PARLIAMENT	25

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS ON

THE DARK SIDE OF BRITISH RULE IN INDIA:

A SIDE SO DARK AS TO MAKE IT DOUBTFUL IF BRITISH RULE HAS BEEN AND IS A BLESSING TO THE MASSES OF INDIA.

'. . . INDIA MUST BE BLED, ...'—*Lord Salisbury.*[1]

'A whole nation, forming one-eighth of the whole human race, and justly claiming to be one of the proudest races on earth, lives on from year's end to year's end on scanty food, always with the dismal cloud of famine hanging over its head, and that, too, while living under a Government which, making allowance for the imperfections inseparable from alien rule, is

ONE OF THE BEST, THE PUREST, AND THE NOBLEST, GOVERNMENTS

the world has ever known. This makes the serious magnitude of the industrial problem which faces us in India.'—*The Economic Situation in India: I. Industrial*, P. 25. Published by the *Poona Sarvajanik Sabha.* [*Sarvajanik Sabha*=literally, 'All the People Assembly.']

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE AND HONOURABLE

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SIRS,—The possible second reading of the Indian Councils' Amendment Bill on January 28th impels me to take the liberty of asking your careful consideration of the facts given herein. That I should be compelled to trouble you in this form is my misfortune rather than my fault. But for the fortunes of the ballot all that is here set forth and much more besides would have been stated in your honourable House. If what is here set forth is true, and though the statements may be denied they cannot be disproved, the time for making a new departure is not to be scoffed at by any optimist, not even by that most optimistic (in matters connected with India) of all the members of your House, the hon. Baronet the member for Evesham.

Thousands of publications have been issued from the India Office, and scores have come from the pens of Anglo-Indian officials, on active service or retired on pension, made up of unstinted praise of British rule in India. The one deduction from all these publications is unmistakeable. It is obvious to the most casual glance. It is that Britain has carried on an unselfish work in India, has rescued a people possessing no administrative faculties from a condition akin to that of the Central African pigmies, and has made of India a land of plenty and of prosperity, with every Indian sitting under his own vine and fig-tree, prosperous, happy, and contented. Few pictures could be more 'out of drawing' than this. There is another side to the condition of India than that contained in such official works as the Annual Report on the Moral and Material Progress of India or in a number of non-official pamphlets and books which need not be mentioned. I do not deny many of the achievements proclaimed in those books. As heartily as any living man I

[1] 'It is not in itself a thrifty policy to draw the mass of revenue from the rural districts, where capital is scarce, sparing the towns, where it is often redundant and runs to waste and luxury. The injury is exaggerated in the case of India,

WHERE SO MUCH OF THE REVENUE IS EXPENDED WITHOUT A DIRECT EQUIVALENT.

AS INDIA MUST BE BLED, the lancet should be directed to the parts where the blood is congested, or at least sufficient, not to those which are already feeble for the want of it.'—*Lord Salisbury*, then Secretary of State for India, April, 1875. Parl. Paper, c.-3086-1, 1881, p. 144. The whole of the Minute is of a remarkable character. In it Lord Salisbury disclaims statesmanship and says that it is only in a policy of 'drifting' 'that a permanent solution of these difficult questions will be given to the vast communities of India.'

appreciate the good work which has been done in India. But all the work—whatever the intentions of the workers—has not been good. While the official side of the story is, no doubt, true so far as it goes, there is another side. And, what is more, that other side is contained in the very books which are supposed to record the triumphs of British rule and to describe its goodness. Almost without exception the facts recorded below are taken from Indian Blue Books. If, therefore, there is any quarrel with what is stated, the quarrel must not be with me but with the Administration and the Home officials, who themselves record, in bare columns of figures, what I have quoted, and have accompanied with what seem to me to be necessary and fitting observations. Some features of the dark side of our rule I give to-day. Others will appear from time to time. Animated—for the last sixty years at least—by the best of intentions we are, with our eyes shut to the consequences of our acts, producing some of the worst of evils. In some directions we are doing great good, good which is neutralised by a steadily-growing mass of evils which are accompanied with hideous and widespread suffering. The matter for most serious regret is that the good we are securing in India might have been equally well attained without present, and certain future, failure. It is too late now to prevent many of the consequences of our mistaken autocratic rule, but it is not too late to interpose so that greater evils may not ensue, while it is a solemn, sacred, and imperative duty at once to lessen our unintentional wrong-doing, and to stop further similar conduct in the future. In one of his most powerful orations, an oration delivered in your honourable House, Lord (then Mr.) Macaulay used a most striking illustration. 'It was,' he said, 'as Bernier tells us, the practice of the miserable tyrants whom he found in India, when they dreaded the capacity or spirit of some distinguished subject, and yet could not venture to murder him, to administer to him a daily dose of the pousta, a preparation of opium, the effect of which was in a few months to destroy all the bodily and mental powers of the wretch who was drugged with it, and to turn him into a helpless idiot. That detestable artifice, more horrible than assassination itself, was worthy of those who employed it.

IT IS NO MODEL FOR THE ENGLISH NATION.'

Macaulay, with fine indignation, proceeded:—'We shall never consent to administer the pousta to a whole community, to stupefy and paralyse a great people whom God has committed to our charge, for the wretched purpose of making them more amenable to our control.' Alas! that it should have come to this, that a countryman of Macaulay's is compelled to assert, on the strength of official statistics alone, that England, without meaning to do so, by want of foresight and through thinking mainly of her home industries and the interests of her own sons before those of her distant subjects, that

ENGLAND HAS ADOPTED THE MODEL AND HAS ADMINISTERED THE POUSTA TO A WHOLE NATION.

The Indian nation, so far as its masses are concerned, is being stupefied, demoralised, and starved. Starved! By a policy which, while crushing the Indian people, enriches the already wealthy British community. Progress in India, strictly so-called, is confined to the few millions who live in the large towns and who are brought into contact with the visible tokens of British supremacy and the expenditure of British capital.

It needs only to be repeated that nearly the whole foundation for the statements which follow is obtained from official records. If the facts err at all, they err in under-statement. Nowhere is there exaggeration.

INDIA GROWING POORER AS THE DIRECT RESULT OF BRITISH ADMINISTRATION.

'The people of this country [India] generally, never had, or can have, the smallest occasion for any foreign importation of goods, the necessaries or superfluities of life, raw or wrought up, excepting perhaps a third of the cotton used in home manufactures.'—*British India Analysed.* 1793. *Anon.* (In the British Museum Catalogue ascribed to Mr. Greville, by others to a Mr. Sullivan.)

Before Britain obtained authority in India the continent was self-contained: a harmonious condition of things existed whereby varied occupation provided opportunities of employment for all without producing excess in any particular direction. Agriculture was always the mainstay: industries, nevertheless, played an important part in the general economy, while all profits arising from land and industry were circulated in the land in which they were earned. India was prosperous then as she is not prosperous to-day.

All is now changed. Britain, after first destroying nearly all Indian industries, takes the profits made in India, and spends them out of the country. Britain, no doubt, without meaning to do so, has exploited, and is exploiting, the Empire, regardful above all things of that which will make the connection between Britain and India more and more profitable to the former country, and heedless as to the effect on the latter country.

'THERE IS A DEEP AND DEEPENING POVERTY ALL OVER THE LAND, SUCH AS THE WORLD HAS NEVER BEFORE SEEN ON SO VAST A SCALE.'

The main features of the present economic condition of India may be described as—

(1) *Acute, widespread, growing, poverty all over the country;*
(2) *Increasingly severe distress among the lower classes; and*
(3) *Absence of economic staying-power in the masses.*

This state of things is brought about by 'the lamentable prostration of our old, many-sided, and balanced system of national industries', 'a prostration which, by reducing the industrial classes in the country to one dead, low level of resourcelessness and helpless dependence, renders impossible all material progress of the country, and, with it, any adequate provision for a normally expanding population.' (*Sarvajanik Sabha* pamphlet, p. 3.)

The extension of agricultural operations in India during the past twenty-five years is no proof of increased prosperity. The expansion has been compulsory, necessitated by the collapse of other industries. Of the foreign trade, respecting which so much is written, the like statement holds good: the extension of that trade is no proof of *Indian* prosperity. In its present channels and on its present lines that trade is a great loss to the country and to the community.

An exactly-opposite doctrine to this is sedulously preached. 'Great is the company of the preachers.' For example: In 1884, a Select Committee of your House on East India Railway Communication was appointed. One of the objects upon which it was instructed to enquire was as to the part which railways played in the 'prevention of famine,' 'the necessity for increasing the works likely to protect the country against famine.' Nearly five hundred folio pages of evidence are printed; not one of the seven thousand four hundred and thirty-eight questions asked was put by any Member of Committee as to how railways could prevent famines, or, as a matter of fact, had prevented famines. The late Mr. Slagg, once or twice, came perilously near the point in question when he was pressing Sir W. W. Hunter on economic points, but even he never directly touched that point. Years before the Select Committee began its sittings your House was in possession of publications received from the Indian Famine Commission which showed that whatever might be the advantages of railways in RELIEVING famine—great advantages as I know from what I myself saw—they had absolutely done nothing to PREVENT famines. The evidence, indeed, if railways had anything at all to do with the matter, was the other way.

From Part III. of the Appendix to the Famine Commission's Report [c. 3086, 1881,] the following facts are drawn:

FAMINES DURING THE PRE-RAILWAY AND RAILWAY ERAS.

PRE-RAILWAY ERA.	POST-RAILWAY ERA.
From 1802 to 1854 there were **13** Famines; probable life loss **5,000,000**	From 1860 to 1879 there were **16** Famines, and life loss of **12,000,000**

In the former period many parts of the continent were in that state of anarchy and frequent wars which Anglo-Indian historians never tire of using as a foil to the Roman peace we have established: indeed, two of the famines were directly traceable to war. In face of these official figures it is clear that, whatever railways may have done, they have not *prevented* famine. They have done marvels in relieving distress; but for them the five millions who perished in 1876-79 would have been ten, or maybe fifteen, millions. But, how terrible the condition of a people who, with steamships and railways, with Burma and Bengal to indent upon for food-stuffs, nevertheless died by millions!

In the enquiry of 1884 the illusion and delusion respecting the commerce of India were most cogently described. Sir W. W. Hunter, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., who was specially sent from India to persuade the House of Commons to sanction large railway expenditure, thus put the orthodox and generally-prevailing view of Indian prosperity in answer to questions 7213 and 7214 asked by Mr. Slagg. I quote them in full:—

'7213. [Mr. SLAGG]: You are aware that there is another objection to these exports, and that is based on the commercial aspect, namely, that they are necessary, or, at any rate, are used in order to pay the home charges; what do you think of the objection?—[Sir W. W. HUNTER]: I think that this objection also[1] contains a half-truth, and a somewhat dangerous half-truth. The facts are these: the home charges may be taken, not unreasonably, at £17,000,000. I believe the usual figure is taken at £16,000,000.[2] The natives of India do not merely export sixteen or seventeen millions' worth of produce every year. They export from seventy to eighty millions' worth of stuff at present (the exports vary). This is a much larger amount than they would be compelled to export for any demand to pay the home charges. The net result of their exportation is that, after they have paid the home charges, and after they have got all they want in the form of imports, they still go on increasing their exports to such an extent that they have seven millions sterling in gold and silver left as a surplus which they put in their pockets every year. The imports of silver and gold during the past ten years have averaged seven millions more than the exports of silver and gold from India. There is, therefore, a yearly surplus of seven millions' worth of gold and silver which the natives obtain in payment of exportations which they certainly

[1] The 'also' refers to the preceding question and answer; in the answer it is stated that, owing to the railways and the higher prices they were assumed to ensure, people would be better able to stand the strain of a famine. The facts, as recorded by the witness himself in the 'Gazetteer of India,' do not accord with the opinion. Except, indeed, to point to a horrible state of things. Of the district of North Arcot, in Madras, Sir William says, in 1876-77 it was traversed by two first-class railways, and yet was largely denuded of population. He also states, in the course of his evidence, that there are portions of India in which no increase of cultivation can follow from the introduction of railways.

[2] In the present year it is Rx. 23,000,000.

make in the most voluntary manner.[1] They make this huge exportation of £80,000,000 not to defray £17,000,000 of home charges, but because it pays them to export this £80,000,000 worth of produce.

'7214. [MR. SLAGG]: Do you regard these exports as presenting anything like a trustworthy guide of the prosperity of the people?—[Sir W. W. HUNTER]: I consider that the largely-increasing exports of India form one indication of the increasing prosperity of the people. But I do not accept the argument that a large export is a conclusive proof of the prosperity of the people.'

Sir William puts the matter in unmistakable terms: 'The natives of India . . . . export from seventy to eighty millions' worth of stuff at present.' This is exactly what they do not do.

The exports from India (alphabetically) are mainly: Coffee, Cotton, Grain, Hides, Indigo, Jute, Opium, Seeds, and Tea—taking all those which are of more than one million sterling in value per annum. Of these, not even excepting Cotton, Grain, Hides and Seeds, how much of the profit realised goes to the Indian people? Only a mere fraction. European capital and European firms command the trade. The shipping for carriage is in their hands; they buy in the districts for export at Calcutta, Bombay, Kurrachee: the margin left to the Indian producer is of the smallest. In regard to Coffee, Tea, Jute, Opium, the capital and complete control are in European and Governmental hands. Such profit as is made does not go to the Indian people. It goes to the European merchant and the British investor, who, thinking only of their own profits—and small blame to them, from the mere mercantile point of view, that they are considering their profits—are the instruments in the hands of the Government for administering the pousta to which Lord Macaulay so eloquently and so powerfully referred.

As regards imports one has only to mention the names of the chief articles and their value to show that it is not the Indian merchant who controls and profits by them. I take the figures from the Statistical Abstract for 1888-89 (p. 213):

Articles of Import.	Value.
Apparel	Rx. 1,243,007
Coal, Coke, etc.	1,907,213
Cotton Twist and Yarn	3,746,797
,, Manufactures	27,764,508
Hardware, etc.	1,102,205
Machinery and Millwork	2,316,871
Metals	4,054,013
Oils	2,072,825
Provisions	1,588,103
Railway Plant	2,493,239
Silk, Raw and Manufactured	2,588,107
Sugar and Spices	2,646,167
Manufactured and Raw Wool	1,686,833
	Rx. 55,209,888

These items account for more than five-sixths of the imports. Sir William Hunter does not need telling in whose hands is the vast proportion of the above commerce: he could an' he would, give their names from memory, so notable are the European houses concerned. A consideration of these figures and an examination of the principles which control the barter or trade between nations will explain, if sight be not lost of the heavy payments made in England year by year on account of India, why India sent nearly a hundred millions of produce out of the country in 1888-89.

As for the treasure (gold and silver) said to be absorbed, more hereafter. Enough to state here that a portion is used for coinage, a large proportion goes to the Feudatory States, partly for opium, and is one source of their general prosperity, while, when all is told, the amount per head is so small as to become ridiculous as an argument affecting the vast mass of the people.

If all the trade were in Indian hands, if all the capital were Indian capital, Sir William Hunter's arguments and statements would be sound and might be accepted. As it is he wholly misinformed the Committee on the most essential point of the enquiry,—that is, he misinformed the Committee if the point of view I am urging be accepted as sound.

To return to the main argument, interrupted of necessity so as to make clear the fallacy which underlies the arguments of most Indian officials, especially the arguments of the brothers Strachey, on the so-called prosperity of India. 'The deep and deepening poverty all over the land', and that 'deep and deepening poverty' the consequence of our mode of rule is the main point I wish, just now, to insist upon.

The relative annual earnings of each inhabitant in

ENGLAND is ... ... £41 | INDIA ... ... £2 (or Rs. 28)

That is to say, when every allowance is made for the cheaper living in India, any average English-

[1] No account is here taken of the quantity of silver used to replace wear and tear of coinage and the increase of coins required by an expanding trade; nothing of the demands, for trade purposes, by the European banks; nothing of the absorption by the Feudatory States of bullion in return for their exports (see Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's calculations on p. 15); or of many other matters which, it is contended, Sir William Hunter ought to have taken into his consideration.

man is many times better off than any average Indian. How terribly this remark is borne out by the facts will appear very shortly.

Allowing for good crops all over the country and assuming each inhabitant has the full Rs. 28 to deal with, let us see how his affairs work out in any year:

	Rs.	A.		
Annual income ...			Rs. 28	0
Taxation of all kinds ...	2	8		
Food (that estimated for a camp follower)[1] ...	22	5		
Clothing ...	1	8		
Sundries ...	0	8 —	26	13
Balance ...			R. 1	3

Supposing the whole income of India were fairly divided among all the inhabitants that is the result which would be produced. (Let it be noted there is no margin here for expenditure upon house, furniture, education, marriages, deaths.) As there are a goodly few Indians wealthy, a fair proportion well-to-do, a number making a little more profit than R. 1 3 (say 2s.) per year, there must be many millions who are living—if their existence can be called life—on a starvation diet. (See the example from Madras, given below.) In addition to that, however, this margin of 2s. per head has against it as a set-off (1) loss of agricultural cattle, and (2) wear and tear and loss of implements, tools, and other requirements of trade and agriculture, estimated (1) by Mr. Hume, while Secretary to Government Agricultural Department, at Rx.7,500,000, and (2) at about the same amount, *i.e.*, Rx.15,000,000 in all, per annum. When deduction on these accounts is made there remains, on an average,

A margin of fourpence-halfpenny per head per annum !

This, too, after the basis of calculation adopted has been 'a very low standard of living, hardly compatible with the minimum requirements of healthful existence and working efficiency.' In Britain, the like surplus, after a standard of living of a very different and vastly superior kind, with home comforts and conveniences undreamed of by the average Indian, is

More than Four Pounds sterling per head per annum.

INDIA'S *individual excess income yearly.*	BRITAIN'S *ditto.*
4½d. !	**£4 3s. 2¼d. !**

Britain's self-ruled colonies show a stronger contrast when placed by the side of India.[2] Yet, so righteous and so considerate are we in our dealings with a helpless community, so high is our notion of honour, that we make India pay the cost of the India Office here (£220,000 a year) while the rich Colonies pay never a penny towards the maintenance of the Colonial Office. Is it not true, as is so often said of us as a nation, that we impose upon the weak and defenceless, and immediately succumb to those who are strong and possess self-governing institutions ?

Under these circumstances

THE CONDITION OF THE INDIAN PEOPLE MUST BE SHOCKINGLY BAD.

It is shockingly bad. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, having the material for the year in his possession, found that, in 1868-69, the income of each inhabitant in the Madras Presidency was only about Rs.18 per head per annum. (The position of the Madrassi is certainly not better now than it was twenty years ago; in all probability it is some degrees worse.) Leaving taxation, clothing, etc., out of consideration, this is Rs. 4 less than the cost of a camp follower's food, and is about the amount spent in Indian gaols for food alone for the criminals confined therein. 'Shockingly bad!' Indeed, it is. In the same year Mr. W. R. Robertson, then head of the Agricultural Department in Madras, said :—'The condition of the agricultural labourer in India is a disgrace to any country calling itself civilised.' And, according to a letter published in the *Times* on August 23rd, 1886, so crushing were the burdens which British officials, when administering the Durbhunga estates in Bengal, put upon the unhappy cultivators on those estates, that no fewer than five thousand ryots abandoned their farms and homesteads, and fled into Nepal. If five thousand Siamese were to swarm into Burma for a like reason, or five thousand Turkomans sought

---

[1] Here are four scales of diet:

Jail diet	Rs.17·2 per head per annum.	Camp follower's diet	Rs.22·5 per head per annum.
Sepoy's diet	31·5 ,, ,,	Sir J. B. Peile's agriculturalist	30 ,, ,,

[2] This is indicated by some remarkable figures which I will quote. If India, solely agricultural for more than three-fourths of its people, should excel in anything it is in the possession of cattle of all kinds. Particularly should this be the case when the religion of three-fourths of the community—the Hindu religion—invests the cow with great sanctity. Alike for labour and manurial purposes cattle are a necessity in an agricultural country. It is possible to compare all India except Bengal with Australia, and this how the comparison works out:—

AUSTRALIA, Population 4,000,000.		INDIA (less Bengal), Population 140,000,000.	
1. Horned Cattle	9,662,446	1. Cows and Bullocks	48,279,967
2. Horses	1,534,063	2. Buffaloes	12,941,738
3. Sheep	101,312,668	3. Horses and Ponies	936,819
4. Pigs	1,041,654	4. Mules and Donkeys	971,563
		5. Sheep and Goats	27,619,978
Total ..	113,550,831	Total ..	90,750,065

If the comparison were followed further, and if due allowance were made for the large size of the Australian sheep-runs, the desperate poverty of the stocking of the land in the older country would become even more manifest.

refuge in the Panjab because of Russian tyranny, there is no need to speculate as to what the English press would say of either the King of Siam or the Czar of Russia, or how many scores of questions would be asked in your House of the Parliamentary Under Secretaries for India and for the Foreign Office.

Here are some official statements as to the condition of the people, all made within the last twelve years:

1. Sir AUCKLAND COLVIN in 1885:

The masses of the people are 'men whose income at the best is barely sufficient to afford them the sustenance necessary to support life, living as they do on the barest necessaries of life.' (Speech on the License Tax Amendment Bill.)

2. The GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, 1888:

'There is evidence to show that in all parts of India there is a numerous population which lives from hand to mouth, is always in debt . . . . does not [? cannot] save, and has little or nothing to fall back upon in bad seasons.'

Nevertheless the Government of India is, on the whole, very well satisfied with the condition of things! It further declares the pessimists have no grounds for their pessimism! This sort of writing by the authorities is very common in India, and is untrustworthy. The kind of information which the Government of India is generally content to accept may be judged from the fact that, in 1877, they refused to believe that famine was at all acute in Southern India until a public meeting was held and an appeal was made to Britain. Again, less than two years ago, the famine in Ganjam (in which *only* 20,000 people died: fancy Mr. Balfour being permitted to let 20,000 people die in Western Ireland in the present crisis!) was being neglected until persistent questioning of Sir John Gorst in your House led to Lord Connemara himself visiting the scene of disaster and applying adequate measures. It should be added that the enquiries with which Lord Dufferin's Government was so easily satisfied were of a very fragmentary character. The Director of the Department of Land Records and Agriculture, Bengal, urged this on his own superiors when (in Letter, Calcutta, April 27th, 1888), after this most significant statement; 'My personal opinion is that the condition of the agricultural classes in Behar, including parts of Bhagulpore Division,

HAS DETERIORATED WITHIN THE PERIOD OF BRITISH RULE, AND THAT IT IS DETERIORATING,

while that of the population of the greater part of Bengal Proper has improved;' he proceeded to remark: 'The reports now submitted, though some of them are valuable so far as they go, do not afford grounds for forming any general conclusions.' A thorough enquiry is wanted. In England (see Sir Louis Mallet's remarks towards the end of this Letter, and bear in mind the general conduct of the Secretary of State and his subordinates during the past few years) there is a strong determination that no such enquiry shall be allowed.

3. Mr. HARRINGTON, Commissioner of Fyzabad, 1888,

maintains that the assertion that 'the greater proportion of the population of India' suffered from a daily insufficiency of food, is 'perfectly true as regards a varying but always considerable proportion of the population for a considerable part of the year in the greater part of India.'

4. The BENGAL GOVERNMENT admits, 1888,

on the testimony of local officers, that in Behar, the labourers, including petty land-holders, who form forty per cent. of a population of 15,300,000, 'can earn a very scanty subsistence.' In the language of the local officers, they 'can only take one full meal [per day] instead of two.'

5. NINE OFFICIALS, taken from all parts of the Empire give striking testimony:

In Midnapore district, for instance, in *Bengal*, a Settlement Officer writes: 'The ryots live from hand to mouth. Two full meals of coarse rice per day are a luxury to them.' 'Their physique has deteriorated from insufficient food and constant attacks of malarial fever.'

In Pooree, Dr. Sandel, Civil Surgeon, thinks that 'the poorer classes are not properly fed or clad. They barely subsist on coarse rice and a spinach curry cooked without oil. As a rule, they do not have more than one meal a day.'

In the *North-West Provinces*, the Commissioner of Allahabad remarks, in a general way, that the normal condition of the poorer classes of the people is one of semi-starvation; and the Collector of Banda writes that 'a very large number of the lower classes of the population clearly demonstrate, by their poor physique that they are habitually either half-starved, or have been in their early years exposed to the trials and severities of a famine.'

In the *Punjab*, in the Jallundur Division, Rai Maya Dass, Extra Assistant

Commissioner, speaking of thirty-three exceptional villages in the Ferozepore District, says that 'many of the people lie down hungry in the evening, and seldom get sufficient for both meals during the twenty-four hours.'

In Shahapur, Mr. Ghulam Farrid Khan, Extra Assistant Commissioner, 'holds that half [of one] per cent. of the Hindus live at starvation point, and that ten per cent. have an insufficient quantity of food, while four per cent. of the Muhammadan are at starvation point, and twenty per cent. do not obtain sufficient food.'

In *Bombay*, in the Ratnagiri District, 'the Ghat cultivators, for the most part, cannot get enough to allay hunger in the hot weather; Mr. Rand says one-fifth cannot, and, according to Mr. Candy, one-fourth cannot, get sufficient food for several months.'

In *Madras*, in North Arcot, the Collector states that 'grinding poverty is the wide-spread condition of the masses'; and two missionaries also agree in thinking that 'many poor people, though they do not actually starve, go through life on insufficient food.'

6. A few years earlier Mr. Toynbee, the Collector of Patna, thus wrote of the labouring classes and small traders in his district:

'The expression, "living from hand to mouth," has assumed for me a more definite and tangible, if less satisfactory, meaning than it ever had before. I have been into and over the houses of hundreds of *telis*, *baniyas*, *gwallias*, *halwais*, and other similar castes, and have seen how they live and what they eat. I could not have believed, had I not seen it for myself, how abject is their poverty. Hunger satisfied, and decency propitiated, they seem to have no further ambition. Many of them do not know what it is to have two meals a day, and most of them do not know when they rise in the morning whether they will have one full meal or not. Wages have remained as before, while the prices of all kinds of food have increased.' It must be added that, in the Hooghly district, in 1888, Mr. Toynbee found the people in what he calls comparatively comfortable circumstances.

7. The sub-divisional officer of Sewan says of the poorer classes in Sanur:

'It is, however, a fact that the average size of the farms of the poorer classes does not exceed five bighas, and that seven persons, according to the census, constitute a household. The average value of the crops produced in one year, taking good land with bad, on a single bigha, is Rs. 25, of which Rs. 3 is payable in rent. Therefore, amongst the poorer classes, that is some 600,000 persons, seven persons have to subsist on Rs. 102 a year, or only one rupee and four annas [1*s.* 10½*d.* with rupee at 1*s.* 6*d.*] each a month. Yet even this condition represents a state of things much more favourable than half of the poorer classes, or 300,000 persons, can obtain. Tens of thousands of them have not more than two bighas of land, and the number of those who have only two to three is equally great. There are, besides, the landless day labourers, who number from 10 to 15 per cent. of the inhabitants of every village. How they contrive to subsist in years of scarcity, and particularly during such lengthened periods of dearth as the first five months of the official year under report, is a more difficult question than most people are prepared to answer?'

8. Mr. C. T. METCALFE, C.S.I., Collector of Durbunga, 1888:

'Previous to the Behar famine of 1873-74 there were five occasions on which local scarcity of food grains prevailed within a period of seventeen years; on each occasion there was more or less loss of life amongst the pauper population; yet these partial failures of crops at the time attracted no marked attention. The agricultural poor accepted the distress with that marvellous patience and meekness, characteristic of the Indian in famine years, almost without a murmur.'

Such passages might be continued, literally by the score, from all parts of India.

In the Home-ruled portion of India (as an hon. member of your House who visited India less than a year ago styled the Feudatory States) a very different state of things exists. The ever-deepening poverty of the British Provinces is unknown there. The greater prosperity of the non-British-ruled portions of India is the subject of observation by the ordinary traveller, who, at a glance, can see that the inhabitants of these States are better off than the inhabitants of the British Provinces. Even Sir Richard Temple has placed testimony on record as to the flourishing condition of many of the States. His testimony is to be found in an official publication. Another ex-official, Sir James Peile, K.C.I.E., has gone further; he has instituted a comparison between agriculturalists in British Provinces and Indian States. One of the tables he prepared, by which he desired to make his comparison clear, is of so striking a character that I do not hesitate

to quote it. In a 'Note on the Economic Condition of the Agricultural Population of India,' Sir James gives the following particulars:

NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES (British).

—	Area of Farm.	No. of Family.	Gross Receipts.	Expenses. Cost of Hired Labour and other outlay.	Expenses. Rent of Revenue.	Expenses. Domestic Expenses.	Expenses. Total Expenses.	Balance. Credit.
	Acres.		Rs. a.	Rs. a.	Rs. a.	Rs. a.	Rs. a.	Rs. a.
Land Owner ..	52	3	318 0	28 0	87 0	162 0	277 0	41 0
Occupancy Tenant	22	5	298 0	40 0	71 0	127 0	238 0	60 0
CENTRAL PROVINCES (British).								
Occupancy Tenant	44	7	345 0	20 0	51 0	215 0	286 0	59 0
Do.	25½	6	178 0	9 12	26 0	129 6	165 2	12 14
HYDERABAD, DECCAN (Indian).								
Occupancy Tenant	50	5	552 8	96 0	50 0	180 8	326 8	226 0

Among the remarkable facts indicated by this table (which Sir James Peile gives without note or comment) are these: (1) In Hyderabad, as compared with the North-Western Provinces, it would appear that a farm of fifty acres produced two-fifths more of crop; the tenant in the Indian State pays three times and a-half as much for hired labour and other outlay, the tax on his land is thirty-seven per cent. less, on domestic expenses he spends nearly twenty rupees more, and, at the end of the year, has Rs. 226 in hand against Rs. 41—that is, *five hundred and fifty per cent. more!* (2) In the Central Provinces a farm of 25½ acres did not give quite one shilling (R. at par) per acre surplus, while in two out of the three other instances the surplus was about one rupee per acre. In the third it was Rs. 3, against Rs. 5½ in the Feudatory State. All along the line, in some instances to a tremendous extent, the facts (selected, be it remembered, by an official) are against British administration and in favour of Indian. This is exactly what might have been anticipated. The instances given are true samples of the present condition of things. I have a number of others ready for submission if further illustrations are wanted. Will the House of Commons sit heedlessly by in presence of such a tremendous indictment of British rule as the figures just quoted afford? Will its members, many of whom are touched to the quick by the deplorable condition of parts of Ireland, do nothing, when the opportunity is before them, to better so sad a condition of land and people?

In some Indian States taxation is higher than in the British Provinces, but the people are so much better off that they carry the additional load with ease, while those in British Provinces, in a similar position in life, struggle under the lighter load. On the other hand, there are a number of States where the taxation is as low as, and others—known to be amongst the best-governed communities in India—where it is considerably lower than, the average in British India. *Ex. gr.*, Travancore, 5s. 8d.; Kolhapur, 5s. 6d.; Mysore, 4s. 10d.; Marwar, 4s. 10d.; Jeypore, 4s. 3d.; Kishengarh, 4s. 10d.; Banswara, 3s. 8d; and Seroli, 2s. 3d.

THE STANDARD OF LIFE IN INDIA IS STILL DETERIORATING.

Salt—an essential in the daily food of a vegetarian people even more than in the food of those who enjoy a more varied diet—is consumed in smaller quantities than are required for healthy life: 'In regard to the consumption of salt, for instance, which undoubtedly is with us, as the late Professor Fawcett declared, as much a necessary of life "as the air we breathe or the water we drink," Dr. Cornish, late Sanitary Commissioner, Madras, in reply to the enquiries instituted by the Government of India, stated "that actual experiment had shown that nearly one ounce of salt is eliminated by the human body daily, and that to replace this waste, at least from three-quarters to one ounce daily, *i.e.*, from 17·1 to 22·3 lbs. annually of alimentary, salt should be consumed;" and some decades ago, the consumption of salt in this country did approach, if it did not reach, the level demanded by the laws of sanitary science. Now, however, it is barely 10 lbs. per head on an average." Mr. Mulhall writes in his Dictionary of Statistics: "The consumption in the United Kingdom averages 40 lbs. per inhabitant for cooking or condiments, the rest (of 72 lbs. average consumption) being used for chemicals, manure, &c. Reduced death rate and higher efficiency of workmen are results of the greater consumption of salt."' (*Sarvajanik Sabha pamphlet*, p. 20.) We have so administered India, *of course in the interests of the people*, that in some parts of the land,

WE HAVE INCREASED THE SALT TAX FIVEFOLD!

More than that, it should not be forgotten that *salt was first taxed in Bengal for the sole purpose of providing princely salaries for British officials so as to remove them from the temptation of private trading and other objectionable practices.* 'Under Indian rule,' says the India Office itself, in one of its publications, salt was taxed at a low rate.'

The economic condition of India, after a century and a quarter of British rule, is such that, while our own countrymen, our own country, our own trade and manufactures in connection with India, our own shipping, as shown in succeeding pages, have secured for us almost fabulous wealth,

and is still adding to it, the country we profess to rule solely in the interests of the people has gone from bad to worse. That condition may be summed up thus:

'(1) That, as things stand at present, the people earn little, spend little, and can save next to nothing—a small class alone being in a position to save. There is neither a grain reserve nor a money reserve to fall back upon.

'(2) That a very large, though varying, mass of the people live from hand to mouth on insufficient and unwholesome food; and even in good seasons, being entirely dependent on agriculture, with the first failure of rain they invariably become helpless. Sir C. A. Elliott estimates the number of half-starved people at seventy millions, and Sir W. W. Hunter estimates them at forty millions. In the words of the Government of India itself, there is always a risk, in the event of failure of rain, that the more indigent class of the people may be overtaken by distress in various degrees and forms.

'(3) That with numerous classes in the country, both agriculturists and non-agriculturists, the struggle for existence is very severe, and that the standard of life is already dangerously low.

'(4) That, in all parts of India, signs are not wanting to show that in the case of considerable numbers the standard of life is deteriorating.

'These four features mark the situation as far as can be gathered from available data, the last being the most serious. No greater misfortune can befal a nation than an enforced deterioration in its standard of living, and nothing usually proves so destructive of its industrial *morale*. A high standard of comfort is the *vis inertia*—the resisting moral force which nerves to greater exertion and endurance in adverse times, and enables a people to tide over them. The worst misfortunes that can befal a nation have no terror, if they do not depress its standard of comfort; while the blessings of enforced tranquillity become a curse, when a nation slips into willing reconciliation with a lower standard of life. The consequences of a low scale of living among our labouring classes are making themselves felt in many directions. There has set in, in the lower strata of the population, the evil of physical deterioration, which there is no mistaking. In parts of North India and Madras, local officers make casual reference to the fact of this falling-off in the physique of the lower classes. In Nellore, the Civil Surgeon, remarking that criminals always increase in weight after they have been in jail some time, thinks that a large number of the population do not get sufficient food to develop their muscles. Rise in weight of prisoners during incarceration is noticed in Madras and other Provinces, and, though variously accounted for, is significant on this point. In Midnapore District, the native Settlement Officer distinctly refers to this fact of deterioration of physique following on insufficient food. Indian labour is thus losing in efficiency and is already condemned as deficient in working energy; inefficient labour means deficient production. In stating the experience of the Bombay Mills on this point of comparative efficiency of Indian labour, as compared with English labour, Mr. Cotton, in his speech on the subject of factory legislation for India at a meeting of the Bombay Millowners' Association held in December, 1888, said: "The Indian Mill with 6,000 spindles less than its English competitor requires 3·4 times as many hands to keep its machinery going." Similar, too, is the experience of the Public Works Department. In brick-work of the first class, six native bricklayers are required to lay fifteen hundred and twenty bricks in ten hours, which three English bricklayers can do in the same space of time. The *recruiting* operations of the native army also serve to throw a side-light on this point, and the preference shown by our recruiting officers—notably in the Panjab and Bombay—for Beluchis and other men of the trans-Frontier States, as being superior in physique over Indian recruits, is significant in this connection. The cumulative effect of these and other facts of a similar nature is to show how very real and serious is this evil of physical deterioration resulting from inadequate or unwholesome food in the case of the lower classes' (*Ibid*, pp. 21-22).

The result of the state of affairs so graphically described is that life is less prolonged, less valuable, in India than in England.

A SUBJECT OF THE QUEEN IN BRITAIN, ON THE AVERAGE, HAS THE CHANCE OF LIVING SIXTEEN AND A HALF YEARS LONGER THAN A SUBJECT OF THE QUEEN IN INDIA.

There is no need why there should be so vast a difference, or indeed any difference at all, if only the economic conditions of the two countries were equal. India, to those who adapt themselves to the climate and live with care, is as healthy as England.[1]

Deaths from 'Fever'—deaths bearing a close connection with enfeebled health arising from long privation—are now greater than they ever were, in spite of our boasted improved sanitation. In the eight years from 1880 to 1888, years, be it remembered, of generally good crops, Fever deaths rose from 2,748,000 in 1880, to 3,584,786 in 1887, each year, with two exceptions, showing an increase not merely on the preceding year, but on the first year of the series, while all after the first were higher than 1880. Taking 1880 as a normal year, the excess deaths, in the eight years, were 4,349,922, or

NEARLY FOUR AND A-HALF MILLIONS OF PREVENTIBLE DEATHS!

[1] The India Office itself admits this. In his Report on the Sanitary Measures in India in 1888-9, dated June, 1890, Mr. W. T. Ronson, of the Revenue and Statistics Department, India Office, says: 'It would seem that, apart from the question of deficient registration, the inhabitants of villages were much healthier than those of towns; and this in spite of the condition of the villages being such that it 'could hardly be worse.' 'The small size of the villages,' Dr. Richardson, the Sanitary Commissioner, says: 'their wide dispersion over the country, the freely-ventilated though poor huts or houses, and the larger proportion of the lives of the inhabitants passed in the open air, more than compensate for the absence of the advantages secured to the dwellers in towns by systems of sanitation more or less inefficiently carried out.'—(*Par.* 9.)

Here is a significant and terrible comparison:

Loss of life by war in all civilized States in the world, from 1793-1890	**4,500,000**	Excess Deaths, over those recorded in 1880, that being a normal year, in eight years, from Fever only in India	**4,349,922**

Less than six years ago, the late Mr. John Bright, when speaking in St. James's Hall at the banquet given to Lord Ripon on his return from India, spoke with horror of a similar comparison (see *India for the Indians—and for England*, p. 70) between the life-loss by war all over the world and the life-loss in India in eighty years from famine. What that good and sympathetically-minded man would say of the condition of things revealed by the above figures it is hard to imagine. Probably, he would have addressed your House with an eloquence and a pathos which would have far surpassed his famous Crimean speech. In presence of this awful preventible slaughter, Government of India, India Office, the Imperial Parliament, the British Press—all are silent! During the period named the death-rate from Fevers alone has gone up from 16·49 per thousand to 18·12 for the whole of India, while in the North-West Provinces and Oudh the rate has been as high as 27·48! Every part of India, save Coorg and Mysore, have shared in the increase: in the last year of the series Madras and Berar show a slight recovery over the figures even of 1880. It should further be indicated that, as compared with the three famine years of 1877, 1878, and 1879, when the deaths from fever totalled 9,331,834, the three 'plenty' years of 1886, 1887, and 1888 totalled 10,430,255, or 1,098,421 additional deaths! But the subject must be pursued a little further, and the deaths from all causes during these triennial periods considered. The years 1877, 1878, and 1879 are generally acknowledged to be amongst the most terrible years of the century in India. Famine was prevalent in the North, South, and West of the Empire. Yet the recorded deaths of those years fell short of the recorded deaths of the years 1886, 1887, and 1888, by more than half-a-million. The figures are as follows:—

	No. of Deaths.		No. of Deaths.
1877	4,784,619	1886	5,016,877
1878	5,163,996	1887	5,508,454
1879	4,970,008	1888	5,087,138
Total ...	14,918,713	Total ...	15,512,469

Or a total of nearly six hundred thousand additional deaths in the last triennial period. Making full allowance for the annexation of Upper Burma, and ever-improving statistics—the latter should be balanced by the bettered sanitation of which we make so much boast—the result is most startling and most terrible. These figures would seem to indicate that, so impoverished are the people becoming, normal years now are as bad as were famine years less than ten years previously. An analysis of the details for several of the divisions of the Empire would justify this assertion. Space and your patience forbid that analysis here and now.

'A whole nation, forming one-sixth of the whole human race and justly claiming to be one of the proudest races on earth, lives from year's end to year's end on scanty food, always with the dismal cloud of famine hanging over its head, and that, too, while living under a Government which, making allowances for the imperfections inseparable from alien rule, is one of the best, the purest, and the noblest Governments the world has ever seen. This makes the serious magnitude of the industrial problem which confronts us in India.' (*Ibid.*, p. 25.) It does, indeed. What causes the yearly-increasing Fever deaths is the growing innutrition of the people and the consequent lowering of vitality, whereby an ague instead of merely shaking a man for a few days and then leaving him, now takes away his life. 'Insufficient clothing, poor food,' are two among five reasons given by Government for the increase of fever deaths. This admission concedes all I assert.

The terrible distress in India is

NOT CAUSED BY OVER-POPULATION,

as some eminent writers—strange to say Sir W. W. Hunter among them—are only too ready to assert. Early marriages in India do not result in large families. The average Indian family (that is the progeny of one couple: of course, under the Hindu Family System a family proper may be very large in numbers) is not greater than the average European family and is smaller than the average English family. The rate of population-increase in India is less than three-quarters of one per cent. per annum,[1] against one and one-third in the United Kingdom. Further, in times of famine it is not the overcrowded districts which lose most people in proportion to the population, but the less crowded districts. An Indian writer claims, and claims, not unfairly that his people are entitled to take credit 'for those prudential restraints on which Malthusian economists lay so much stress'. Besides, in England and in France, increase of population has been accompanied with great increase of wealth. In England, in 1806, there were fifteen millions of people with £170,000,000 of income; in 1882, nearly thirty-five millions with £1,247,000,000 of income. Properly ruled, India would tell a similar story, a story in which,

[1] The Indian supreme authorities have themselves asserted that the increment, in prosperous times, ought to be 1½ per cent. per annum. Again: on another occasion, they put a lower percentage. In each case there was adaptation of rate of increase to the argument.

while population is a little more than doubled income has increased seven times. Lord Macaulay's striking illustration on this point is probably within the recollection of every hon. member.

The following Population Returns, in which the Census of 1881 is compared with 1872, compiled from the Statistical Abstract, are sadly instructive:

Presidencies or Provinces.	Districts. Increase.	Districts. Minus.	Remarks.
1. Bengal	43	8	Increase considerably more than 1 per cent. per annum.
2. N.-W. Provinces and Oudh	33	16	Nearly two millions decrease. In the districts showing increase that increase is often infinitesimal.
3. Panjab	27	5	1,415,019 minus. Thirteen years passed between the respective Censuses.
4. Central Provinces	18	—	Increase more than 2 per cent. per annum. The purely Indian States show an increase of nearly 75 per cent., viz., from 1,049,710 to 1,709,720, chiefly on the Bengal side.
5. Madras	13	8	2,000,000 deficient, or, at $1\frac{1}{2}$ p. cent. p.a., over 4,000,000.
6. Bombay	16	8	Nearly 1,500,000 deficient.
Total	150	45	

Population figures—allowing 1 per cent. per annum increase:

	Minus.		Plus.
N.-W. Provinces and Oudh	2,000,000	Bengal	6,200,000
Panjab	1,415,019	Assam	760,000
Madras	3,000,000	Berar, Ajmere, etc.	520,000
Bombay	1,500,000	Central Provinces	1,664,967
Mysore	1,250,000		
Total	9,165,019	Total	9,144,967

The evil in India is not OVER-POPULATION, but UNDER-PRODUCTION, and that under-production is a necessary consequence of the system of alien rule which now exists.

An agricultural labourer in India only earns ONE-TWELFTH of the sum which his compeer in France, the United States, and the United Kingdom earns, not because he is less industrious, but because he has no capital, because he is handicapped by the conditions which his rulers have created for him. Likewise the Indian artisan, although, 'all things considered, he is one of the most hard-working, the most frugal, and the most orderly workers in the world; patient, persevering, and contented, not given to indolent habits,' 'cannot earn even one-tenth of what his foreign rivals are able to do under apparently less advantageous circumstances.' (*Ibid.*, p. 35.)

The competition to which the Indian artisan is exposed, as has been well said, is of two kinds—*Competition from Without* and *Competition from Within.*

'It is *competition from without*, as measured by the continued expansion of our import trade, which floods the country with finished products and obliges him to confine himself to the servile, because less intelligent and more precarious, position of a supplier of raw agricultural and other products of great bulk and small value. It is *competition from within*, as marked by the growth of foreign industries in the country—thriving on resources which are ours—which bring him little or no return besides the wages of labour, while the profits and the skill and the intelligence are all monopolised by the foreigner. It is the competition of the giant with the dwarf, of the great powers of Nature and the skill of science with untutored man. The pressure of this many-sided competition, with which he is confronted, as yet shows no sign of abatement. It is still growing, growing in extent and severity with every new mile of railroad opened for traffic and with every new line of steamers entering our ports; and each year as it passes by leaves him weaker to maintain his ground in the contest. As things are, the industrial worker of this country stands in the struggle perfectly helpless and hopeless. He has not the requisite resources of capital, skill, and organization at his command with which to help himself, nor can he look for help in any direction. The State, which alone can help him and help him effectually, and which ought to help him with its vast credit and great resources, rules him in the interests of foreign trade and industry, and not only withholds its help from him, but—under the influence of economic theories which, whatever their theoretic soundness, have no application to the circumstances of the country—thinks it its duty to help his rival, already so strong with the strength which a superior civilization gives him, by every means in its power, by its fiscal measures, by its forced Forward Public Works policy and by its pioneering enterprise.

'This formidable competition of the foreigner, thus strong and helped, has prevailed for nearly half a century in a more and more intensified form, and we now see the result in the utter prostration and collapse of the industrial system of the country, which presses most heavily on the Indian working classes. The unrestricted competition of the world has thus resulted (1) in a vast, almost revolutionary and disastrous *derangement* of our national system of co-ordinate industries, (2) in foreign *exploitation* on an increasingly-extended scale, taking up branch after branch of that field, and (3) in a severe and extensive industrial *depression*, with its enervating despondency killing all hope of bettering one's condition by self-exertion and mutual co-operation.' (*Ibid.*, pp. 36-38).

Nearly all the people are CROWDED ON THE LAND. Eighty-six per cent. of the population depend solely upon agriculture. The foreigner, who has nearly everything else in his hands, has a part of the land also. Of the foreign trade the Indian people have barely one-tenth. (*Ibid.*, p. 42.)

Europeans in India (excluding army), possessing nine-tenths of the foreign trade, say	30,000	Indians, possessing one-tenth of the foreign trade	207,000,000

If the whole urban and rural areas are taken together, the Indian working population exhibit the following proportions, employed in various industries, as compared with the United Kingdom:—

India.	Per cent.	The United Kingdom.	Per cent.
Connected with land	86	Connected with land	14·6
Other industries	12	Manufactures, etc.	30·4
Trade, etc.	2	Various	55·0
Total ...	100	Total ...	100·0

'A whole nation, driven out of more than one-half of the total field of profitable employment in the country which is peculiarly its own, and obliged to earn a scanty and precarious subsistence, with its entire fabric of varied and co-ordered industries all but over-thrown—this is the most disastrous economic change, which has been brought about in this country under the operation of economic laws which no attempt has been made to control or modify. And the change has not come about without its inevitable attendant incidents. Many an industrial centre is all but, industrially speaking, deserted. Where are now those millionaires, we might ask, with Captain Beauclerk, who, in past days, "beautified India and comforted the poor"? Where is now our old silk industry, once the admiration of the world, and where that weaver-class, the pride of ancient India? Where is now the muslin industry of Dacca, about which Mr. Mukerjee writes in his "Art Manufacture of India" (page 318)? "Three years ago I was informed by one of the manufacturers of Dacca muslin that the generation of women who spun the yarn of which the finest fabrics were made, has all passed away, except two very aged beings." Where the silk-industry of Thana which once had four thousand weavers, but where "there are now only seven families of weavers working fourteen looms, which, in ordinary years, do not turn out more than Rs. 5,000 worth of silks?" (Campbell's "Gazetteer for Thana," page 378, part I.)' (*Ibid.*, p. 43.)

It is admitted that a part of the industrial prosperity of India was shattered by the internecine struggles in the period immediately prior to the establishment of British supremacy. Fairly, however, is it argued in the following passages that Britain's *lâches* are very great:—

'It was in such a state of her industrial life that India passed under British sway and was drawn into the vortex of the whole world's international commerce and intercourse, and came to be exposed to the full force of the competition of the highly perfected industrial organization of Europe and America. Unprepared for such a formidable competition, and obviously unable to cope with it unaided, she was fairly entitled to the aid of the State at least for a time during which to put herself in a proper posture of defence. But the British Government in this country did not think that their duty lay in any such direction. They did not think it right or expedient to foster by artificial aids the system of native industries, and save it from its destined doom. And, accordingly, they not only declined to stand between us and our rivals and extend to us a helping hand in the fight, or even observe a strict impartial attitude of neutrality and allow us to settle our account as best we could, but, going further, they did all they could to help the foreign competitor as against us in various ways—by adopting Free Trade measures, by pushing railway extensions, by making grants of special privileges to foreign enterprise, etc., etc.

'The result has been, as might have been expected, disastrous all round. The Indian community, thus left unaided and unprepared to struggle with its formidable foreign antagonists for the last thirty years and more, finds itself nearly driven into a corner and on all sides checkmated, while the field is being more and more occupied by foreign enterprise. There is thus a most injurious and perilous derangement of our national industries. But, however vast and serious this *derangement* is, it is most satisfactory to note that there is yet no *disruption*—no break-up. Our well-poised system of co-ordered industries still stands, after all the deadly assaults made upon it, though very much out of working order, yet strong in the strength of its traditional and moral basis. We have still its chief constituent elements intact, though, from the point of view of numbers, in vastly altered relative proportions. There are still our industrial classes, though they hold their ground on most precarious tenure. The agricultural classes stand firm, and our weavers (Koshtees and Salees), our dyers (Nilaris and Rangaris), our copper-smiths (Tambats), our oil-pressmen (Telis), our carters (Otaris), our blacksmiths (Lohars), our potters (Kumbhars), our leather-workers (Jingars and Mochis), etc., are all still alive, though only in the cramping atmosphere of rural life, and vastly reduced in numbers, to attest the powerful vitality of our industrial organization. The position of all those classes is now fiercely assailed and even threatened, but the fact that they still maintain their footing is a most encouraging, bright fact, which goes a long way to relieve the otherwise thick gloom of our present situation. It is the mainstay of our opes for the recovery of our lost industrial *status* in the world's system.' (*Ibid.*, pp. 45, 46.)

THE PROGRESS OF THE FOREIGNER IN THE INDUSTRIAL FIELD OF INDIA.

Foreign Exploitation is both *Direct* and *Indirect*—*Direct* as measured by the growth of foreign industries in the country, and *Indirect* as measured by the expanding foreign trade on its import side in so far as it leads to the displacement of native products. *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, make up the *Direct*.

(*a*.) AGRICULTURE.

TEA.—The cultivation of Tea was first experimentally attempted by Government in 1834. In 1840 it made over its experimenting establishment to planting Companies. The acreage under Tea was 124,836 in '75-6 and is now nearly 300,000. The average yield has increased during the period from 26 million lbs. to 100 million lbs. The planting Companies number 130 with a capital of Rx.2,480,000.[1] The value of the annual outturn at 1s. 4d. per lb. is £6,250,000. The number of Indian hands employed is 280,000. It is estimated, says Sir W. W. Hunter, that a sum of at least a million and a half sterling is annually expended in connexion with the tea industry.

[1] The sign Rx. signifies ten rupees: thus Rx. 2,480,000=£2,480,000 at the conventional rate of Rs. 10 = £1.

Coffee.—The information is defective. About 176,000 acres are under coffee, and the total yield is estimated at 41,000,000 lbs. The industry seems at a stand-still. The value of the culture is about £1,500,000. In the coffee works about 7,000 hands are employed, while the estates would, probably, employ about one person (man, woman, or child) to the acre, say 180,000.

(b.) MINING AND QUARRYING.

Coal.—Sixty-eight collieries are working; the total output from the mines is 1,388,000 tons valued at Rs. 5 per ton; equal to Rs. 7,000,000. Seven coal companies are working the mines, chiefly in Bengal, with a capital of Rs. 5,200,000. The number of workpeople employed is, including men, women and children, 24,794.

Gold.—About eight gold mining Companies with a capital of Rs. 2,800,000.
Diamond and other precious stones.—Only two companies with a small capital of Rs. 25,000.
Stone-Quarrying.—Two companies with a capital of Rs. 300,000.
Petroleum.—Two with Rs. 400,000.
Copper and other mines.—Four with Rs. 2,500,000.
Slate.—One with Rs. 125,000.
Total capital.—Rx. 1,113,000.

Add to the list the recent concession of mining rights to the Assam Railway Company in Assam, a similar concession by the Nizam's Government to the Deccan Mining Company, and the lease of the Burma Ruby Mines to a company presided over by Sir Lepel Griffin.

(c.) MANUFACTURES.

(1) Cotton Mills.—Eighty-nine mills at work with 16,723 looms and 2,190,000 spindles. They consume 264 million lbs. of cotton in all per annum; employing on an average 73,000 hands. The capital invested in the industry is not short of ten millions sterling. [As far as can be roughly calculated, one-third of the industry is in Indian hands.]

(2) Jute-Mills.—Twenty-four mills at work with 7,104 looms and 135,000 spindles, making 143,000 tons of jute per year. The nominal capital of the Jute companies is Rx. 2,850,000, but the figures are defective. The number of hands employed is 49,000 men, women and children.

(3) Woollen Mills.—Four mills with an aggregate capital of Rx. 180,000, employing 1,400 hands.

(4) Paper Mills. — Nine mills, capital Rs. 380,000; total value of the outturn, Rx. 235,000.

(5) Indigo Factories.—Employing above 300,000 hands; output Rx. 3,000,000 [part of the industry in Indian hands.] Total amount, expended in the indigo districts by the European planters, estimated at Rx. 1,000,000.

(6) Silk Mills.—Capital Rx. 17,000; number of hands employed=16,000; *Silk filatures* with a capital of Rx. 40,000, giving work to 27,000 hands.

(7) Jute and Cotton Presses.—Part in Indian hands, employing 25,000 persons and numbering 192 Presses.

(8) Iron and Brass Foundries, employing 8,000 persons.
(9) Sugar Factories giving work to 12,000 persons.
(10) Lac Factories „ 6,000 „
(11) Oil Mills, employing 1,000 people.
(12) Tobacco Farms, employing 400 people.
(13) Tile Manufactures, employing 1,500 people.
(14) Pottery Works „ 400 „
(15) Cement Factories „ 300 „
(16) Rope Works „ 1,000 „
(17) Manure (Bone, etc.) Manufactures.
(18) Saltpetre Manufactory.
(19) Soap Factories.

The hands employed in all these concerns together number about 500,000, and in some of the enterprises the Indians have a share as, *e.g.*, in Cotton Mills, Indigo Factories, Silk Mills, etc.

(d.) TRADE.

Foreign Trade.

(1) Shipping employed is of 7,160,000 tons capacity.

Of the total tonnage:

96·5 p. c. is foreign,
3·5 „ native.

The annual trade shows an aggregate value of Rx. 175,000,000, and the profits of sea-carriage may be put at Rx. 7,100,000, per year.

(2) Importing and Exporting Firms mostly foreign. Not even one-tenth of the aggregate trade of the country is in native hands. The foreign share of profits in this business may be roughly estimated at Rx. 20,000,000. [R. at 1s. 6d. £15,000,000.]

INTERNAL TRADE.

(1) CARRYING TRADE—monopolised by the *Railways*. *Mileage* open for traffic=13,390.

Total capital outlay=Rx. 170,000,000.
Gross Receipts=Rx. 18,704,536.
Working expenses=Rx. 8,930,000.
Net Revenue=Rx. 9,773,000.
Number of passengers carried=88½ millions.
Aggregate tonnage moved=19½ million tons.

Net loss to the State up to 1886= Rx. 35,000,000
Natives employed on the lines=210,382.

RAILWAYS—miles:

State—7,952 [Capital, £100,000,000].		
	Guaranteed=	3,895
	Assisted=	644
	Feudatory States=	899
	Total	13,390

RECAPITULATION.

Native Indians employed in all these industries:

Tea	280,000	a rough approximate estimate.
Coffee works	187,000	
Mining, etc.	27,000	
Manufactures	500,000	
Railways	210,000	
Total	1,204,000, or, say, one million and a quarter of work-people.	

Take the annual wages of each workman on an average at 60 rupees, the total wages received would show an amount of Rx. 7,750,000 per year.

FOREIGN EXPLOITATION IN AN *INDIRECT FORM*.

(*c*.) IMPORT TRADE—its expansion as regards the import of *finished* products from 1864-5 to 1886-7.

No.	Articles.	1884-5. Rx.	1886-7. Rx.	Increase.
1.	Cotton Piece Goods, Yarn, Thread, etc.	13,227,000	29,172,000	121 per cent.
2.	Hardware and Cutlery	526,000	928,000	76 ,,
3.	Glass and Glassware	355,000	508,000	43 ,,
4.	Metal Manufactures	608,000	3,834,000	531 ,,
5.	Oils	71,000 ('75-6)	1,408,000	1,883 ,,
6.	Paper and paste-board	345,000 (,,)	392,000	14 ,,
7.	Provisions	717,000	1,179,000	64 ,,
8.	Salt	341,000	768,000	125 ,,
9.	Silk Goods	443,000	1,383,000	212 ,,
10.	Sugar, refined and unrefined	318,000	2,080,000	554 ,,
11.	Umbrellas	198,000 ('75-6)	274,000	38 ,,
12.	Woollen Goods	867,000	1,660,000	91 ,,
13.	Other Articles	6,427,000	6,476,000	

Increase in the twenty-four years being in regard to these finished products from Rx. 24,000,000 to about Rx. 49,000,000.[1] (*Analytical Table in Sarvajanik Sabha Pamphlet, partly revised.*)

This subject is of so much importance, and is so little understood or apprehended in this country that, at the risk of being thought tedious, I must make a somewhat long extract. That extract is from the convincing and masterly reply which Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji wrote for the *Contemporary Review*, August and October, 1887, to an article by Sir M. E. Grant-Duff, G.C.S.I., previously published in the *Review*. The arguments of the eminent Indian statistician and publicist have never been answered, nor can the position he has taken up be shaken. Sir Grant Duff was evidently content to accept his defeat and say nothing more on the matter. Mr. Naoroji, dealing with the trade of India and referring to those who obtain advantage from it, wrote thus:

'I begin with the question of the trade of British India. What is the true trade of British India? The trade returns of British India, as published in Blue-books, both in England and India, are misleading to those who do not study them with certain necessary information to guide them. What are given as trade returns of British India are not such really, as I explain below. The exports of the produce of a country form the basis of its trade. It is in return for such exports, together with ordinary commercial profits, that the country receives its imports. I shall first analyse the so-called exports of British India. A large portion of them, together with their profits, never return to British India in any shape, either of merchandise or treasure; though in every true trade all exports with their profits ought so to return. The present exports of British India consist of—

'1. The exports of produce belonging to the Native States.

'2. The exports of produce belonging to the territories beyond the land frontiers.

'3. The exports of the produce belonging to European or other foreign planters or manufacturers, the profits of which are enjoyed in and carried away out of the country by these foreigners, and do not belong to nor become a portion of the capital of the people of British India. The only interest the people have in these exports is, that they are the labourers, by whose labour, at poor wages, the resources of their own country are to be developed for the profit of the foreigners, such profit not to remain in the country.

[1] The returns for 1888-89 show increase in every item except Sugars.

'4. Remittances for "home charges," including interest on public debt held in England, and loss in exchange, and excluding interest on debt which is incurred for railways and other productive works.

'5. Remittances for interest on foreign debt incurred for railways and other productive public works. What in this case the lenders get as interest is all right; there is nothing to complain of in that. In other countries, beyond the interest to be paid to the lenders, the rest of the whole benefit of such loans remains to the people of the country. This, however, is not the case with British India.

'6. Private remittances of Europeans and other foreigners to their own countries for their families, and on account of their savings and profits. These remittances, together with item four, and what the foreigners enjoy in the country itself, are so much deprivation of the people, and cause the exhausting annual drain out of the very poor produce or income of British India. This is India's chief evil.

'7. The remainder are the only *true* trade exports of the produce belonging to the people of British India.

'Let us now examine the actual figures of the so-called exports of British India, say for 1885. For easier understanding I give the figures in sterling, taking the conventional £1=Rs. 10. The amount of merchandise exported is £83,200,528. This, however, consists of not only domestic produce and manufactures of all India, but also foreign merchandise re-exported. I do not include treasure in these exports, for the simple reason that the gold or silver is not produced in India, but is simply a re-exportation out of what is imported from foreign parts. I take all my figures from the statistical abstracts published among parliamentary returns, except when I mention any other source. I take, then, exports of merchandise to be £83,200,528. We must first know how much of this belongs to the Native States. The official trade returns give us no information on this important point, as they should. I shall therefore make a rough estimate for the present. The population of all India is nearly 254,000,000, out of which that of the Native States is 55,000,000, or about 21·5 per cent.; or say, roundly, one-fifth. But the proportion of their exports will, I think, be found to be larger than one-fifth. All the opium exported from Bombay comes from the Native States. A large portion of the cotton exported from Bombay comes from the Native States. According to Hunter's "Imperial Indian Gazetteer," one sixth of such cotton comes from Kathiawad alone. To be on the safe side, I take the total of exports of the Native States to be one-fifth only—*i.e.*, £16,600,000. Next, the export of merchandise from the frontier countries is about £5,300,000. I may roughly take only one-quarter of this as exported out of India. That will be £1,300,000.

'The exports of coffee, indigo, jute manufactures, silk, tea, etc., which are mostly those belonging to foreign planters and manufacturers, amount to about £11,500,000. I cannot say how much of this belongs to native planters, and not to foreigners. I may take these exports as £10,000,000.

'Remittances made for "home charges" (excluding interest on railway and productive works loans), including interest on public debt and loss in exchange, come to about £11,500,000.

'Remittances for interest on foreign loans for railways and other public works are about £4,827,000. I cannot say how much interest on the capital of State railways and other productive works is paid in England as part of the interest paid on 'debt' (£2,612,000). If I take debt as £162,000,000, and capital laid out on productive works £74,000,000, the proportion of interest on £74,000,000 out of £2,612,000 will be about £1,189,000. If so, then the total amount of interest on *all* railways and public works will be about £6,000,000, leaving all other home charges, including exchange and interest on public debt, as £11,500,000, as I have assumed above.

'Private remittances of Europeans and other foreigners for their families, and of savings and profits, and for importing merchandise suitable for their consumption, may be roughly estimated at £10,000,000, though I think it is much more.

'The account, then, of the *true* trade exports of British India stands thus:—

Total exports of all India and Frontier States		£83,200,000
Native States	£16,600,000	
Frontier Territory	1,300,000	
European planters	10,000,000	
Home charges	11,500,000	
Interest on all railways and public works loans	6,000,000	
Private remittances	10,000,000	
		55,400,000
The true trade exports of the people of British India		£27,800,000

Or say, roundly, £30,000,000 for a population of nearly 200,000,000, giving 3s. per head per annum. If proper information could be obtained, I believe this amount would turn out to be nearer £20,000,000 than £30,000,000 for the *true* trade exports of the people of British India. To be on the safe side, I keep to £30,000,000. It must be remembered that this item includes all the re-exports of foreign merchandise, which have to be deducted to get at the true exports of domestic produce.

'Is this a satisfactory result of a century of management by British administrators? Let us compare this result with the trade exports of other parts of the British Empire. As I have no information about the foreign debt of those parts, for the interest of which they may have to export some of their produce, I make allowance for their *whole* public debt as so much foreign debt. This, of course, is a too large allowance. I take interest at 5 per cent., and deduct the amount from the exports. I am, therefore, evidently under-estimating the exports of the other parts of the British Empire. As the exports of British India include re-exports of foreign merchandise, I have taken the exports of all other countries, in a similar way, for a fair comparison. No deduction for any payment of interest on foreign debt is made for the United Kingdom, as it is more a lender than a borrower. I cannot give here the whole calculation, but only the results, and they are these:—

Countries.	True trade exports per head (1885). *s.*	*d.*	Countries.	True trade exports per head (1885). *s.*	*d.*
The United Kingdom	149	4	Cape of Good Hope (exclusive of diamonds)	35	5
Australia (including bullion and specie which it produces)	271	0	North American Colonies	70	5
			West India Islands	75	4
Natal	28	8	British India, only	3	0

'The general result,' says the writer of the article in the *Sarvajanik Sabha Journal*, 'is as we have described before:—(1) there is the sharp and enormous curtailment of our industrial field open to the industrial classes; and (2) there is the alarming advance of the foreigners to a corresponding extent. We have seen the extent of the first evil, let us now turn to the second. The above particulars give a synoptical view of what we may call the progress of *foreign exploitation* in the country.

'From this synopsis, it will be clear how broad and extended is the course of foreign *exploitation* in this country. It extends to every branch of our industrial field, and broadening down through a long zone of cotton, woollen, silk fabrics and metal manufactures, narrows itself at the close even so far as to embrace even such minor manufactures as tiles and rope, and it measures

the effect, till now, of that fierce competition of the superior industrial systems of Europe and America, to which this country has had to submit.

'(1) *Agriculture* apparently is the only industry of ours that is yet safe, but even here the careful observer cannot fail to note that the state of things is such as to afford ground for grave anxiety. There is plenty of European capital waiting for investment in India, and high authorities like Sir J. Caird are already advising British investors to buy up Zemindari estates as one of the best Indian investments.[1]

'(2) As to *Mining*, the Indian field is entirely in foreign hands. The occupation of our Dharads and Warekaris is gone and there is no fear to the foreigners of native rivalry here. We have neither the requisite knowledge nor the requisite means required for a successful working of our mines. The extension of European collieries in this country is a serious form of foreign *exploitation* in this field of Indian industry and demands jealous watchfulness on our part. There are already seventy collieries at work with an annual out-put of one and a half million tons. Coal is one of the indispensable auxiliaries of modern material progress, and we are bound to take care lest our splendid coal fields should all pass into *adverse foreign* possession and the supply of coal should become a *foreign monopoly*. Our coal is somewhat inferior in quality, but the extent of our coal fields is only surpassed by that of the United States, China, and Russia. It would seem to afford one of the most lucrative fields of investment for the Indian capitalists—even more lucrative than the cotton or jute mills, and yet somehow our collieries are not in native hands. The concession, also, of extensive *mining* rights and privileges to European mining companies in whole provinces (*e.g.* in Assam and the Nizam's territory) is another fact of equal seriousness, which we cannot but regard with grave apprehension.

'(3) In the department of *trade*, the foreign trade of the country, being exclusively the creation of *foreign* effort, continues still in foreign hands, barely one-tenth falling to the share of the natives of the country. The *shipping* is *foreign* and so, also, are most of the exporting and importing agencies.

'As regards *internal* trade, the railways represent a practical monopoly of the internal carrying trade of the country. The capital expended upon their construction is almost wholly *foreign*, whether they are owned by the Government or all foreign Companies, and their net profits go of course to the foreigner. Further, it is worth remarking that the exporting and importing foreign merchants at the shipping ports are extending their *direct* operations into the interior, as is attested by the increasing activity of European Exchange Banks all over the country. Here, as elsewhere, our greatest weakness lies in our *isolation* and want of organized action, and our weakness evidently is our rival's strength.

'(4) But, above all, it is against our manufacturing industries that the force of this foreign competition has been chiefly directed during the last half century through the agency of the import trade aided by the free trade and railway policy of the State, and it has had its effect in stamping out almost root and branch our urban industries and driving our urban industrial classes to the plough. The European industries that we see around us now in India do not seem to have concurred in any material degree to bring about this collapse of our urban industrial system; on the contrary, it is the overthrow of this system under the blight of the *import* trade that has in a sense paved the way for the successful plantation of such foreign enterprises in the country, *firstly* by clearing the field of native competition, and, *secondly*, by throwing out of work whole classes, and thereby cheapening labour. And it is, now, these foreign industries are completing the ruin of our manufacturing industries even in the remotest part of the country. The rural industries are threatened with the fate which has already overtaken our urban trades and crafts. The tanneries at Cawnpore, for instance, have been at present working to oust the local Mochis, Jingars and Chambhars from their leather industry, which is one of the chief industries of the district. Similarly the woollen mills of the North-West Provinces and the Punjab (*e.g.*, Elgin and Egerton mills) are working, as Mr. O'Conor tells us in his Trade Review for 1880-81 (vide page 40), "to displace the coarser kinds of woollen stuffs, blanketings, and suchlike, for common use, woven by hand." So also, again, are the Pottery works of Ramganj and the numerous brass ware factories directed against our local manufacture. This is one of those effects of this species of foreign exploitation which must cause us the greatest anxiety. Our urban industries have well-nigh perished amidst the stress of foreign competition from without, as represented by the expanding import trade of the country. And now it is our rural industries that are threatened with a similar fate by foreign competition, directed so to speak *from within*, as measured by the growth of these competing European enterprises in the country, and must succumb, unless we bestir ourselves in time. The fight here will be much tougher. Competition from within is harder and more formidable to face than competition from without. The foreign competitor, who remains in his own country, and taking all the advantages and disadvantages of his position, does his business, is not half as formidable as one, who, while living in his own country gets his business transacted out here and thereby combines the advantages of his own and his rival's position *minus* their disadvantages.

'We must in justice note that *per contra* these foreign enterprises in the country at present give work and wages to about one million and a quarter of our working people. This is a set-off,

[1] In Southern India one Zemindari is already in European hands.

however poor and inadequate, against the enormous loss—loss of work, wages, profits, industrial status,—which they have inflicted on numerous classes of our industrial population. Further, there is the *moral* effect of the prosperity of European concerns, which affords ground for satisfaction. The presence of these foreign enterprises in the country is slowly stimulating native effort in that direction, and we have now amongst us, in various provinces, enterprising Indian capitalists, competing, though as yet with only a moderate measure of success, with their foreign rivals in some of their concerns, notably in the cotton, indigo, sugar, and silk industries, on their own ground, in their own field, and on their own lines.'

One result of the condition of things thus described is that

TWENTY MILLIONS AND ONE-HALF OF ADULT MALES ARE WITHOUT WORK IN INDIA ALL THE YEAR ROUND.

Nothing struck Sir James Caird, C.B., so forcibly, when he was in India in 1878 as a Famine Commissioner, than the enormous number of men without work in all parts of the land. 'The waste of energy, converted into its money value at, say, Rs. 40 per adult per annum, represents a loss of Rx. 82,000,000—more than the whole gross revenue of the Indian Empire.' It will be obvious that there are many other evil consequences of this state of things, but space forbids detailed reference to them now. Another word or two on this matter may, however, be suffered.

This most serious fact has been put by Sir James Caird in an even more forcible way. Writing to the Secretary of State for India eleven years ago, he said that while the population of India is more exclusively agricultural than that of most other countries, 'yet the extent of land there cultivated in proportion to the population is the smallest known.' He adds: 'A square mile of land in England, cultivated highly, gives employment to fifty persons in the proportion of twenty-five men, young and old, and twenty-five women and boys. If four times the number, that is, two hundred, were allowed for each square mile of cultivated land in India, it would take up only one-third of the population.' Sir James pursues the question, and remarks: 'In no agricultural country that I know of are so many people to be seen stalking idly about during the hours of labour in India. The streets, and court-houses, and yards, are always full of idlers. The roads are never empty, and the railway stations and railway carriages are crammed with people. Enter a village at any hour of the day, you are surrounded by idlers. *Much of this arises from the absence of other occupations than agriculture*, and, in many parts of the country, from the uncertain character of land tenure.'

Among the consequences of the foreign exploitation of India are insufficiency of working capital and low credit. These are caused by, among other things:

1. The Annual Drain of Indian Resources to England.—By the India Office alone

THE WHOLE OF THE LAND RENTAL OF INDIA THIS YEAR IS BEING DRAWN FOR EXPENDITURE IN ENGLAND.

FIFTY-THREE MILLIONS OF RUPEES WILL BE PAID IN ENGLAND THIS YEAR FOR NON-EFFECTIVE SERVICES.

The drain is year by year increasing. It has increased fifteen hundred per cent. in fifty-four years. The drain was

In 1835	In 1889
£2,000,000.	About £30,000,000.

The amount of money represented by this annual drain is almost incredibly large. Writing in 1838, when the drain had increased to £3,000,000, Mr. Montgomery Martin, in his work, 'Eastern India,' remarked: 'The annual drain of £3,000,000 on British India has amounted in thirty years, at 12 per cent. (the usual Indian rate) compound interest, to the enormous sum of £723,900,000 sterling. . . . . So constant and accumulating a drain, even in England, would soon impoverish her. How severe, then, must be its effects on India, where the wage of a labourer is from twopence to threepence a day.' It needs no demonstration to show how much more terrible the condition of the country is now than it was. One day, unless a change be instituted, the orange will be sucked dry. Woes and calamities, and direful suffering, will indicate the progress of the process.

'The material drain of the British period on the resources of India, sometimes described as India's economic tribute to England—a drain which has risen from Rx. 2,000,000 in 1835 to close on Rx. 30,000,000 during the last fifty-four years—is most serious. The full measure of this drain is not the ratio it bears to the gross annual income of the country, which is about six per cent., but its proportion to the net income after defraying the *necessary* expenditure of the year's maintenance of the people. And this proportion is very nearly one-third.

ONE-THIRD OF OUR NET NATIONAL INCOME GOING OUT OF THE COUNTRY

to meet our foreign liabilities, and bringing no economic return,—this is certainly a heavy loss to the country and goes a long way to account for the small accumulations of capital it has to show. No nation can stand such a drain, and yet hold its own in the industrial field. Of late years this drain has been accelerated by the forward Public Works policy and the Military policy pursued by the Government of India, and the unprecedented fall in exchange value of silver. To raise large loans from year to year on wasteful terms to meet more or less non-productive expenditure in a

country admittedly deficient in capital, and where every farthing that can be spared is required for purposes of industrial development, and that, too, under circumstances which render it not only practicable but highly expedient to borrow abroad, is at best questionable finance, and is certainly bad political economy, in so far as it has the effect of intercepting for non-productive outlay a portion of the country's savings, which would otherwise go to increase the working capital of the country.'

When, in a lucid moment, the Government of India endeavours to promote the purchase of articles manufactured in India the Secretary of State for India interposes a check.

LORD CROSS HAS DONE THIS WITHIN THE PAST TWELVE MONTHS.

His lordship's conduct has been made the occasion of a strong protest from British and Indian merchants in India, a protest of which, it is possible, something may be heard in the House of Commons during the present Session.

2. The Frequent Famines.—These terrible inflictions are occurring at more and more frequent intervals, and on each occasion (save in 1874, thanks to Lord Northbrook's noble conduct) are accompanied by a larger and yet more large mortality, owing entirely to the hand-to-mouth manner in which the people live. Under our present system of administration the condition of the people, in this respect,

MUST GO FROM BAD TO WORSE.

In eighteen years (1860-1878) there have been sixteen famines, with an officially-admitted life loss of 12,000,000. Probably, the real loss was twenty millions.[1] The latest despatches to hand while I am writing accentuate all that has been said about the condition of the country and its ever trembling on the verge of famine. From the *Pioneer* newspaper of December 4th, published at Allahabad, I quote the following telegram :—

'26TH NOVEMBER.

'There is reason to fear that the distress is not confined to Tanjore. Portions of Tinnivelly, Kurnool and Chingleput districts are also beginning to feel the want of rain very badly. The most gloomy outlook is in Malabar, where in one taluq the crops are totally lost, a seven-anna crop [less than half: a sixteen-anna crop being a good crop] being all that is estimated for the whole district. There is no possibility of the annual rainfall being made up by late rains. This year's rainfall to the end of October is 36 inches behind last year's.'

3. The Impossibility of the People Saving.—Once more let the comparative statement of Western and Eastern margins, after subsistence—not an ungenerous subsistence and not a few household and social comforts and conveniences and pleasures in the West, but distinctly a very low subsistence and scanty 'belongings' in the East—has been provided for, be indicated.

	Per Annum. £		Per Annum.
THE UNITED KINGDOM saves annually	154,000,000	INDIA, which has a population as large as the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and the United States, saves (R. at 1s. 6d.)	
FRANCE ,, ,,	140,000,000		
UNITED STATES ,, ,,	210,000,000		
GERMANY ,, ,,	40,000,000		
Total	£544,000,000		£3,750,000

This gives an average of £2 14s. 4d. in the Western countries against $4\frac{1}{2}$d. in India! In the face of these facts there are not wanting Anglo-Indians who, having themselves made a fortune out of the foreign trade of India, write pamphlets and make glowing speeches about the 'wealth' of India. Yes, there is wealth enough in the country if only the Indian people could lay their hands upon it. But it is spirited away to Britain. As against the alleged wealth of the Indians let it, on the other hand, be repeated that the poverty of India is of a kind and degree unknown, on so vast a scale, elsewhere in the world. And yet, these same poverty-stricken people, thanks to those institutions and domestic arrangements which we have not yet destroyed, so stand by one another, so help one another, that no Poor Law has been passed, or Poor Rates levied, in British India! We are, as the preceding facts have shown, travelling rapidly on the high road to both law and levying. Nevertheless, there is not the money in the country with which to pay the Poor Rates when they are imposed.

---

[1] So inefficient in many parts is our grasp of administration that, in some districts, it was only when the Death Returns reached them months after the event that the officials during the Famine of 1876 to 1879 knew starvation was working, or rather had worked, its terrible ends. Further, in January, 1885, in sorely-afflicted Bellary district, famine revealed itself and obtained such a hold that ten thousand men, women, and children in one taluq tramped into non-British territory: there was a chance for existence in the Nizam's Dominions; there was none in Sir M. E. Grant Duff's Presidency. And, when Sir Grant Duff received this information, what did he do? Did he take train to Bellary? It was barely twenty-four hours' journey from Madras. He did nothing of the kind. He contented himself with telegraphing to the Supreme Government for permission to undertake earth-works; and, when permission had been obtained, he wired orders, and proceeded on a pleasure voyage to Pondicherry! He did not mean to act cruelly. No Englishman in India ever does. The pity of it is that, with the best intentions in the world, we are responsible for the perpetration of the most shocking incidents—incidents at which when they occur nobody is so surprised and so distressed as we are ourselves.

4. The Excessive Burdensome of Taxation.

	Rx.
The gross earnings (official estimate) are	540,000,000
Necessary expenditure (omitting all luxuries)...	450,000,000
Net surplus, about	Rx. 90,000,000

Of this Rx.90,000,000, more than half, that is Rx.50,000,000, is levied for taxation. Of the remaining Rx.40,000,000, half (according to the estimate of the Famine Commissioners) is required to recoup the losses of famine years, and 'the net average margin is not much over Rx.20,000,000, or one rupee per head of the population,' as stated on an earlier page. Taxation which takes more than half the net saving is burdensome in the extreme. The position as between the United Kingdom and India may be thus shown :—

The *United Kingdom* provides a net national revenue of £88,000,000, and has £154,000,000 per head per annum to spare.

India provides a net national revenue of Rx.50,000,000, and has £3,750,000 to divide among two hundred millions of people.

Each Briton has annually to spare :	Each Indian has annually to spare :
£4 3 2¼	4½d. !

Probably, the average so works out that not one person in a thousand, that is not one family in two hundred, is able to save a single rupee in any year. Only seven classes, not numerically large singly or collectively, are able to save. These are :—1, Superior land-holders (save in Bengal there are a very few of this class); 2, Government servants in the higher grades; 3, Professional men; 4, Superior manufacturers; 5, Merchants, particularly those engaged in the foreign trade; 6, Bankers (including money-lenders); and 7, Superior traders.

Another main cause of Indian Poverty is *the Defective System of Credit.* Here, the Government could, and ought, to have rendered valuable assistance. Even the Agricultural Banks suggested by Sir William Wedderburn have not been allowed a trial. We could not spare £50,000 for an experiment with them, but we can spend £10,000,000 in annexing Upper Burma and £40,000,000 on our North-West frontier.

'From the foregoing observations it will be seen what powerful causes are in operation to keep our accumulations of capital so low. The material exhaustion of the pre-British period, the ever-increasing material drain to England under British rule, intensified by the forward Public Works policy of the Government of India and the fall in the value of silver, the enormous losses caused by recurring famines, small annual savings, combined with weakened motives and capacity to save—these and suchlike circumstances amply suffice to explain why with all our wealth of undeveloped material resources, we are not able to show any large amount of accumulated capital in the country. But, again, what little capital we have and save is not all available to our industrial classes for purposes of productive investment, and the portion of it that is available is made so available on terms scarcely compatible with success or prosperity of business in these days of severe competition, This is due, as already suggested, to our *defective organization of credit.* Disorganized credit in this country is an inherited evil, and nothing has yet been done to remedy it. There is no banking machinery in this country such as we find in almost every foreign country of the world, organized for the purpose of bringing the lenders and the borrowers into close and sympathetic relations of mutual advantage. There are no chartered joint-stock banks of deposit and issue amongst us, such as those that exist in England, Scotland, etc., no land mortgage banks or *crédit fonciers* such as those which thrive so well on the Continent of Europe. In old times, private individual bankers flourished and did large business, but even these have now given way to foreign competition. At the best, private banking can never command the resources of capital sufficient to meet the legitimate requirements of trade and industry in the country. A considerable stock of capital thus lies comparatively idle, the classes that save not knowing how to place their savings at the disposal of the industrial classes with profit to themselves. The evil is further aggravated by the fact that the majority of those who can and do save are seldom in close personal touch with the industrial classes in the country. Credit, resting on mutual *personal* confidence between the lending and the borrowing classes, independent of State authority, or State support, is a slow growth of long continued habits of thrift and organized action such as we have not been blessed with for ages past. Here was a clear case, if anywhere, made out for State interference, as being the one depository in the country of vast funds and of universal credit and confidence. The State had a peculiar responsibility placed upon it to utilize its agency and its credit in establishing business relations between the saving and the borrowing classes by means of State aided or guaranteed banks of deposit and issue. Even Indian Princes, like the late Maharaja of Indore, recognized this obligation. The State need not spend a pie out of its own revenues, but if it only grants special facilities for recoveries, and, instead of locking up the Savings Bank deposits in its own securities, lends them out under proper guarantee to help *boná fide* enterprise, a great deal of solid good will result. The Government of India has not thought fit to go any further in this direction beyond giving some aid to the Presidency banks. Banking in India thus remains in the same crude disorganized state as before, to the extreme inconvenience and injury of our trade and industry. This being so, it is not surprising to find that, while our trades and industries are literally starving from insufficiency

of capital, and our industrial classes, especially in the villages, are forced to borrow at from twenty to forty—even fifty—per cent. per annum, we have in the towns a considerable number of holders of Government securities amounting to, say, about Rx. 30,000,000 at present, content with four or four and a-half per cent. interest; about 260,000 saving-banks depositors holding deposits of over Rx. 5,000,000 at less than four per cent., and a still larger number of those who invest their savings in ornaments. The large amount of savings thus locked up in gold and silver ornaments is measured by the *net* absorption of the precious metals in the country, and has been estimated by a writer in this journal last year at Rx. 160,000,000 during the last fifty-three years. Taken together, we find that Government securities worth Rx. 30,000,000, savings-banks deposits worth Rx. 5,000,000, and ornaments worth Rx. 160,000,000. or a total of nearly Rx. 200,000,000, are practically lost to the industrial classes of the country owing to the absence of any State guaranteed credit organisation or *conducting medium* between the lending and the borrowing classes. The capital that actually finds its way into industrial channels, under our present defective arrangements, is consequently neither cheap nor abundant; and rates of interest range exorbitantly high all over the country, and more so in the rural than in the urban districts. While in the towns it is possible, as in Gujrath, for first-class borrowers, such as bankers and large traders, to raise money at six to nine per cent. interest on personal credit, rates varying from fifteen or eighteen to twenty-four per cent. are charged in the Deccan districts for similar loans, and various classes, particularly at the lower levels, including agriculturists and hand-loom weavers (as in Nagar), can seldom raise money at less than twenty-four to thirty-six per cent. interest! When property is mortgaged the rates of interest are somewhat lighter; which circumstance shows clearly that rates are higher for personal loans because of the low credit of the borrowers and the great risks attending the recovery of such loans. The following table, taken from Mulhall's "Dictionary," shows how disadvantageous is the position of the industrial worker in India in this matter of capital and interest charged on them:—

CAPITAL ENGAGED IN BANKING, AND RATE OF INTEREST.

—	Millions £.	Amount per cent.	Rate of Interest per cent.
United Kingdom	840	25	3·2
France	205	6	3·9
Germany	285	6	4·3
Austria	166	5	4·7
Belgium	27	5	3·6
Holland	26	7	3·4
Europe	1,852	6	3·7
United States..	531	10	....
Canada	35	8	....
Australia	85	30	....
India	50	2	12·36

'Though thus placed at an immense disadvantage in respect of available working capital, industrial India has yet to compete with these nations of the world. Cheap and abundant capital means good and profitable business, and, *per contra*, where capital is scarce and dear and rates of interest are high, there business cannot have much chance of success. Much credit is, however, due to the people of Madras for their spirited exertions in the matter of providing banking facilities for the trade and industry of the Province. They have at present 268 such associations formed on the joint-stock principle for banking, lending, etc., working with a capital of about Rx. 2,000,000. Similar associations exist here and there in isolated places, but all these taken together form but a drop in the ocean, and the widespread and deep-seated evil of *disorganised credit* still continues almost untouched to hamper seriously the material progress of the country.' (*Sarvajanik Sabha Pamphlet*, pp. 59-63.)

Sir John Strachey, K.C.S.I., when dealing with the Oudh Rent Act, used language respecting Oudh which may be applied to India as a whole now that the condition of the country has become so deplorable. Sir John quoted with approval the language used by Mr. Davies:—'If at any future time "the condition of the cultivating classes should become such as to demand legislative interference; if it should be found that from the operation of causes familiar to modern science the country is reduced to a worse state than that from which the British annexation was intended to rescue it, I conceive that the duty of dealing with such an emergency cannot be evaded by the Government."' The story as to the efforts made by Lord Ripon to ameliorate the condition of the cultivators in Oudh and the summary way in which the Secretary of State's Council prevented the reform being carried out is a remarkable one. It is more than remarkable, it is highly discreditable to the Council. Unfortunately, the story is never likely to be told. Official reserve, doubtless, keeps Lord Ripon's lips closed; the secrecy of the Indian Council is as the secrecy of the grave, unless, indeed, Parliament should call for all papers on the subject: then the grave will give up its possessions.

The Public Works policy of the Government of India, beneficent as in some important respects it has been, has not proved to be the strong moral as well as material factor which it would

(*Concluded on page* 26.)

INDIA.

A JOURNAL FOR THE DISCUSSION OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.

OFFICES: 25, CRAVEN STREET, CHARING CROSS, LONDON.

Communications for the Editor should be addressed "TO THE EDITOR OF *INDIA*", and, if intended for insertion, should be written *on one side of the paper only*, and must be authenticated by the real name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of good faith.

Advertisements, Remittances, Subscriptions, Orders for Copies, and all such communications, should be addressed to "THE PUBLISHER OF *INDIA*", **25, Craven Street, Charing Cross, London.**

Cheques and Post-office Orders to be made payable to *William Digby*, and crossed National Provincial Bank of England, Limited.

Receipts not forwarded for Subscriptions unless the remittance is accompanied by a stamped envelope.

The Annual Subscription is 2s. 6d. post free in the United Kingdom, and Rs. 3 for India. The amount may be remitted by Post-office Order, or Order on a Mercantile House.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—"An Indian on Indian Defence", with other articles and correspondence, unavoidably postponed.

INDIA.

JANUARY 16, 1891.

THE "BLEEDING WHITE" OF INDIA BY BRITAIN.

". . . INDIA MUST BE BLED, ..."—*Lord Salisbury.*

NEVER has the Editor of this Journal felt a deeper responsibility rest upon him than he experiences at the present moment, in issuing the first number of INDIA for the new year. In 1877, when the people in Southern India alone were dying at the rate of half a million a month from starvation and diseases induced by want of food, the position of things seemed as bad as they well could be in any part of the widespread realms ruled by the Queen and governed by the British Parliament. But, bad as things were in 1877, they are equally bad in 1891. The awful scenes of fourteen years ago were soon forgotten, both in India and in this country. Nobody was called to account for the preventible mortality of that period. Not even Sir Richard Temple was put on his trial for decreeing a 1-lb. ration, which caused the deaths of many, many thousands, and which even the India Office—yes, even the India Office—gave the Duke of Buckingham permission to set aside. No Indian administrator is ever held accountable for his deeds. That, largely, is the reason why the condition of India so persistently goes from bad to worse. The Government of India and the India Office are even less amenable to effectual and effective control in any large sense than is the individual administrator. The Indian Government is never called upon to examine into its own acts and to apply a test to its experiments to ascertain whether they have or have not fulfilled the expectations which were formed of them when they were made. Likewise there is no superior authority to perform this duty or to take careful stock of what has been done and to apply remedies when remedies are needed. There are two parties upon whom this duty lies in a paramount degree. Both have shamefully neglected their duty. The first is the India Office. Seldom, if ever, has a Government Department so completely failed to fulfil its highest purpose—(or, indeed, any purposes but the most commonplace, saying Ditto to the Indian authorities, and saying little else)—as has the India Office. In a Court of Righteousness, where it would be possible to make events stand out clear and distinct in the relations they hold towards each other, any man who has ever occupied a position of responsibility in that Department would be overwhelmed with shame, contrition, and confusion of face. He would, otherwise, be no real man. That Office has never been known, spontaneously, to do a single act of justice to any native of India: our mind, after careful thought, is unable to recall any instance in which the India Office has done justice even when facts, as clear as the sun at noon on a fine day in August, calling for its intervention, have been placed before it. No condemnation less severe can adequately express the true state of affairs respecting that Department. Yet there are humane and noble-hearted men in the India Office, men who, in their private capacity, are the kindest, most loveable, most honourable, of Englishmen. But, as Anglo-Indian officials, with no one to call them to account, they are able, with equanimity, to allow the events and incidents occurring in India to pass under their eyes and to see them not. As for the delinquencies of Parliament in the matter of Indian administration, they are patent to all men and are the scorn of every right-thinking person. Unfortunately, there does not now appear to be a "Providence which shapes the ends" of legislative institutions, nor is there a Nemesis to punish the members for neglect of duty: otherwise there would be bad times in store for Lords and Commons alike.

More than half the pages of the present issue of INDIA are taken up with a Letter which is addressed to, and has already been circulated among, Members of the House of Commons. If the indictment contained in that communication is sustainable, a condition of affairs is revealed, the like of which has no parallel at any period of English history. Wrong has, now and again, in past ages, been deliberately committed, by tyrannical and despotic rulers, against communities: such wrong has never been on a very large scale, nor has it been long continued. Here we have to do with the creation of a mass of misery and preventible suffering which it is perfectly horrible to contemplate,—the slow, but sure, starvation of many millions of men, women, and children, wholly guiltless of any offence against either God or man. And this has been done by a Christian nation, say, rather, by Christian men, men of spotless integrity and of earnest lives, who have been, in the main, actuated by a desire to act justly and to promote the welfare of those whom

they were ruling. A great misfortune has attended them. They have not been checked, or subjected to review and control. They have possessed despotic power. The consequence is the slow ruin of the masses of India. No men—Christian men, perhaps, least of all—are fit for the exercise of unchecked dominion. This, and this alone, explains nearly everything that has happened in India of a condemnatory character. A heavy responsibility rests upon the two Houses of Parliament for their non-performance of their duty. Before India came under the direct rule of the Crown, an approach to control over what was done in India was exercised. Through the Board of Control and by the Twenty-Year Inquisition of Parliament into the doings of the East India Company, something was done to avert the known and inevitable consequences of despotic and alien rule. The worst effect of the Mutiny of 1857 was that it brought India under the nominal authority of Parliament, while, in fact, the Empire was left wholly unguarded and its officials entirely uncriticized by parties possessing power and authority. The result is calamitous to the Indian people; it should be heartbreaking to the people of the United Kingdom.

The Letter we publish to-day professes to be based wholly upon facts taken from official documents. The details the writer lays before the members of the House of Commons are not hasty conclusions, resulting from a more or less close personal investigation, though, no doubt, the writer's nineteen years' study of Indian problems and many years' work in direct relation with the Indian people, enable him to illumine the dry details which he discusses. They are, as has been said, simply official admissions put in a form to make them readily understood. Assuming, for the moment, that the author of the Letter is correct, we find these most dreadful conclusions forced upon our attention:—

1. We have brought about in India a deep and deepening poverty all over the land, such as the world has never before seen on so vast a scale;

2. The land is more subject to famine now than it was fifty years ago, owing to easily explainable and remediable causes;

3. The people are growing still poorer and poorer, and weaker and weaker, with the consequence that from fever alone there have been more additional and preventible deaths during the past eight years than there have been deaths from all the wars in the past hundred years; for every death from fever, says an official publication, there are twenty attacks of the disease;

4. We have destroyed the industrial system, an all-sufficing system, built up through the experience of ages, of one-seventh of the population of the world;

5. It is not an accident that our own industrial system has benefited by the destruction of Indian industries;

6. We have monopolized the internal and external trade of India;

7. We leave scarcely any surplus income in the country, but drain to Britain all the industrial and many of the agricultural profits of the community;

8. We have outdone Irish absentee landlordism by incurring such tremendous liabilities in England on account of India that we annually take from that country, to spend in this country, the whole land rental of a continent;

9. We have created such an army of interested individuals that, in this year alone, fifty-three millions of rupees will be paid in London for non-effective services; the item is growing larger year by year; while,

Worst of all:

10. We, through the mouth of Viscount Cross, have most grossly and cynically broken faith with the people, have taken away from them rights and privileges which had been secured to them, twice over, by Act of Parliament, and further sealed to the Indian communities by a most gracious Proclamation from the Queen of England and India; we have allowed a single official to do this without authority from Parliament; in permitting it we have dashed to the ground hopes which sustained our fellow-subjects in the trials to which they have been subjected: some day, if not to them, to their children, it was confidently hoped these rights would be secured.

All this, and much more, is affirmed, and, the writer declares, is proved (for his facts are supplied him by the India Office), in the Letter for which we bespeak the most serious consideration of every one of our readers. We beg that the letter may be read and re-read, and, after a day or two's thought, read again. We beseech our readers to let the facts recorded soak into their minds and possess their souls. If they will do this, so deep will be the indignation aroused, so sorrowful the feelings called forth, that it will be simply impossible for the thoughtful men and women of this country to allow such a state of things any longer to continue. We appeal to our readers, individually, to do all that in them lies to right these grievous wrongs. After all

IT IS THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE,

even more than Parliament, even more than the India Office. Speaking at Croydon a few months ago, after detailing some grievous wrongs suffered by the Indian people, Mr. Bradlaugh, M.P., said to the large audience he was addressing: 'Do not say that it is the Government: it is done in your name, and you cannot acquit yourselves.

This is no party question, and I am not talking of the Government in power more than the Government which preceded it, or more than the Government which will succeed it. But it is part of the system which prevails, I am sorry to say, in Africa as well as in Asia, and wherever we are dealing with what we call the inferior races." We pass these words on to the greater audience which India reaches. And, we further assert that the attack which is made is one which is not made on individuals, and is actuated by no malice against any one: it is an attack upon a system which, undesignedly we fully believe, is so ruinous in its consequences, that if one-hundredth part the like consequences were suffered by the British people in their experience once more would the adage, "History repeats itself," be very promptly justified. The actual injustice done by us in India is working woe daily: the deliberate breach of faith may do even more evil than the injustice which is starving the bodies and paralyzing the souls of myriads of—God's creatures, we were about to write; we will simply use an expression which we can verify and of which there is no doubt—our fellow subjects.

WHAT IS THE REAL INCOME OF INDIA?

SOME STARTLING OFFICIAL FACTS.

Mr. W. Digby, in his Letter to Members of the House of Commons, in the portion on page 19 of this issue, relying apparently upon the statements in the Sarvajanik Sabha's pamphlet, puts the gross earnings of the whole British Indian people at Rx.540,000,000. It seems to us that this is an over-estimate. From data in our possession, data for which Sir David Barbour, the Indian Finance Minister, is responsible, it would seem that the sum is not so large as above stated. Before quoting from Sir David's Note we may state that it is full of most useful and valuable information about the economic condition of India. It has never, so far as we are aware, ever been laid before Parliament. Sir David Barbour's estimate is as follows:—

	Rx.
Annual Agricultural Income ...	350,000,000
" Non-Agricultural Income	175,000,000
Total ...	Rx. 525,000,000

This is Rx.15,000,000 less than the Sarvajanik Sabha and Mr. Digby have been working upon. If the calculation is to be accepted then the margin of 4½d. per head, which is reckoned upon in the Letter, disappears, and there is actually

NO MARGIN WHATEVER LEFT FOR THE AVERAGE INDIAN AFTER BARE SUSTENANCE HAS BEEN PROVIDED.

The £3,750,000 surplus, which provided 4½d. per head per annum, is wiped out! Apparently, the more closely the economic condition of India is looked into the worse it appears. That Sir David Barbour is, in all likelihood, perfectly right, is proved by the lamentable facts given on pp. 5 to 10 of this issue. Was ever a stronger case made out for the appointment of a Royal Commission of Enquiry? Surely such a Commission will speedily be constituted. If nothing in this direction is done the blood which has dyed deep the skirts of the Administrators (in India and in England) of our great Eastern Empire will be found on the garments of our Parliamentary representatives as well. Official soft sayings and smooth words may serve to delude an unknowing public, but they will not wipe out these stains, nor will they prevent Nemesis some day or other exacting retribution.

We must trouble our readers with some further confirmatory facts, for which, too, we are indebted to the present Finance Minister. Let two things be borne in mind: 1. That the cost of maintaining a prisoner in jail in India is, annually, Rs.17·2; 2. That nine-tenths of the Indian people are solely dependent upon agriculture. With these facts in mind will our readers carefully consider the following particulars?

Value of Agricultural Produce per Head.

Presidency or Province.	Rs.
1. Central Provinces	20·9
2. Bombay	20·2
3. Madras	17·3
4. The Panjab	17·1
5. Bengal	15·1
6. N.-W. Provinces and Oudh...	14·8
Average	17·5

The general accuracy of these figures is indisputable. So-called Fever Deaths (really Deaths from Starvation and insufficient clothing) are recorded in proportion to the amount of food obtainable by the people. The N.-W. Provinces and Oudh are the worst, Bengal comes next, and so on.

What, compared with the terrible condition of India, are the questions which are now exciting the attention of Parliament? The incidence and collection of tithes, forsooth, take first place as against any consideration whatever of a vast population who are wasting away by millions a year while we are glorifying ourselves as to the excellent manner in which we are doing our duty by and towards them. Such pitiful fooling ought, once for all, to come to an end.

The first volume of Springtide will be found advertised on page 39. English people have welcomed this excellent paper for children, which is edited and owned by Mr. M. H. Abdul Ali. Indian people, who wish to see a really interesting and useful book in the hands of their children who are learning English, should obtain the volume. The magazine, we understand, will, in future, be published as an annual, and not as a monthly.

THE CONGRESS AT CALCUTTA.

Our readers will be able to form a tolerably accurate idea of what was done in the four days' session of Congress, during the closing days of last year. Reuter's telegrams, under all the circumstances, give an admirable idea of the proceedings. In our next issue we trust to be able to publish a piquant narrative from the pen of our Special Correspondent. Probably, too, if Mr. Caine's artist-companion, Mr. Allan, has made any sketches of the great gathering, as he is sure to have done, we may include those also. The editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette and Budget* has kindly permitted us to make use of such of the blocks as illustrate Mr. Caine's letters as may be suitable for these columns.

A running commentary accompanies our extracts from the British press on the recent Congress meetings Nothing further need be added here than the remark that it is with extreme regret we note the fierce hostility with which the Conservative press has commented upon the loyal and moderate proceedings of the Queen's Indian subjects.

THE INDIAN FINANCIAL YEAR.

A SMALL, BUT MOST IMPORTANT, REFORM.

It is well that the National Congress has put in a firm protest against the chronic annual delay in the presentation and discussion of the Indian Financial Statement. Having put this in the definite form of a petition to Parliament, which, we presume, will be specially presented, this course will afford effective support to the member for Northampton and others who have time and again emphatically condemned this illustration of the habitual neglect with which the outward side of the affairs of our great Indian Empire are treated by the officials of both the great parties in the State. This is so far good: but the mere protest, though it must command respect, will scarcely meet the difficulty. Quite apart from the laxity of the India Office in disregarding the statutory provisions as to the punctual presentation of the Statement, or the habit of the Treasury Bench to deal with any and every topic of the hour rather than meet the Indian balance sheet, there are certain unavoidable obstacles which under present arrangements render delay excusable if not unavoidable.

The whole question of date and procedure depends on the period at which the Finance Minister in India presents his Statement, and that necessarily must conform, as nearly as practicable, to the Indian Government's financial year, which closes on March 31st. Thus, the earliest possible time at which the text and tables of the Statement —to say nothing of the debate on it, which sometimes extends to a fortnight later—is in the last week of April. This leaves as little time as the Parliamentary printers can do with, in order to have it reprinted in the form required by the House, so as to be presented according to the statute not later than May 15th. Then there is the abbreviated "Explanatory Memorandum", which is invaluable to members who are too busy or too inapt to tackle the Statement itself; and the Under-Secretary might fairly claim a week to make himself acquainted with the substance of India's current financial position.

This exposition brings us to the conclusion that the remedy required is the alteration of the Indian financial period so as to make it coincide with that of the calendar year. There are no "interests" of any kind that can be pleaded against this change, which is one of the simplest and most natural kind, and would in many ways afford relief and facility to all concerned.

This subject was fully gone into two years ago in the columns of the *Economist* (October, 1888), in a letter by Mr. Martin Wood, who is ever vigilant in all that makes for the good government of India. We cannot do better than quote from that communication. Mr. Wood says:—

"My object just now is of more restricted scope. It is to fix attention on one practical point in financial management, in respect of which your remarks have elicited response from the *Times of India*, as set out in your last Saturday's issue. That is, the period for making up the annual financial statement in India. This question, thanks mainly to your criticisms, is now brought within narrow and definite compass. To your suggestion that, as according to the Under-Secretary's plea, March is the most difficult month in which to ascertain the exact figures, the statement might be deferred to April or May, the Bombay writer, in ironical vein, states an insuperable solid objection. He says the proposal to keep the Members of Council, Secretaries of the Finance, and the spending departments—their wives, sisters, and cousins—in the sweltering heats of Calcutta, is quite 'too awful to contemplate.'

"Letting the sarcasm pass, it seems to me there is an obvious solution of the difficulty which would meet the case all round. It is this: Why not resolve to make the Indian financial year coincide with the calendar year? The annual statement could then be presented soon after the Christmas holidays, whilst the whole Government of India is located in Calcutta. It is true that the Viceroy is occasionally on tour at that time; but this could easily be arranged. By this course the discussion of the Statement in open Council—with or without new taxation bills, as you very properly urge—could be facilitated under every proper condition. No doubt dinner parties and balls are also just then rife, in the 'city of palaces,' but the 'dancing men' need not count in the serious business of reviewing the financial and fiscal policy of the Indian Empire. This change would be more easily effected, and would be much more convenient than the alteration in the financial year that was made in 1867, when it was set back from April—causing that year to figure as 'eleven months,' which makes it a baffling blot in any nice scrutiny of the continuous finance statistics of India. For the first year of the change an exact three-quarters of the year would have to be dealt with, the figures thus being easily divisible. The bug-bear of the large transactions of March would thereby be effectually disposed of. Sir John Gorst pleaded that even in August it is impossible to get accurate figures as to the year that ends on 31st of March, but by December such accuracy as is possible could certainly be obtained. The railway accounts are already made up for the calendar year: this in itself is a strong argument in favour of the change. Then, consider how greatly this long required adjustment would assist Parliament in dealing with the Secretary of State's definitive statement, the presentation of which might then be insisted on to be no later than March at Westminster. This arrangement would restore parliamentary control over the Indian finance. It would infuse fresh vigour into the efforts of those members who feel and desire to give effect to the responsibility which really rests on the British public in this first-class branch of Imperial business."

The Congress leaders have done the best they knew towards enquiry on the discussion of current Indian financial affairs before the House becomes wearied with the domestic business and party conflicts of the Session. It now remains for their friends here, and also for men of all parties who recognize any responsibility in the right administration of our Indian Empire, to make some united movement on behalf of the salutary change proposed. Any objections that may be raised by departmental officials here in India should be promptly brushed aside as frivolous compared with the immense advantages to be gained.

THE LETTER TO MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.

A NEEDED EXPLANATION.

So much has been said, at one time or another, respecting the pamphlets issued in 1888 by Mr. A. O. Hume, C.B., the Secretary of the Congress, and Mr. Vira Raghava Charriar, a prominent Madras Congressionist, that a word or two of explanation respecting Mr. Digby's Letter to the Members of the House of Commons, which we publish to-day,

may be not merely useful, but needful. The enemies of the Congress identified that organization with the Catechism, and the Conversation, which the two gentlemen named had published on their own responsibility. On the question of principle this, perhaps, did not matter much, as neither pamphlet contained a single expression that the Congress might not well have accepted, or which, if asked, it would have declined to accept. It was generally agreed, however, that the Congress should bear responsibility only for what it did itself, or expressly authorized. Mr. Digby occupies the position of Secretary to the British Committee of the Congress. It is not in that capacity, however, that he has written the Letter in question. It is in his individual capacity as head of the Indian Political Agency, that he has felt himself compelled to undertake this duty. Probably, it may be well to add, that Congress funds are not used for the publication of the document, but that Mr. Digby is publishing and distributing the Letter at his own charge. It is not pleasant to have to make such explanations: very much indeed the contrary. But the unscrupulous character of some of the attacks on Indian reformers seems to make this statement necessary.

THE SALT TAX ACT IN INDIA: HOW IT IS ADMINISTERED.

ALMOST INCREDIBLE PROSECUTION OF TWO WOMEN.

Two prosecutions of Indian women under the Bombay Salt Act of 1890 have just been disposed of by the Bombay High Court. It will be remembered that the Congress in its recent session, as, indeed, it has done in all its sessions, protested against the crushing tax on salt. That is an evil: it is not the only evil. The salt laws of India are of the most Draconian character. Here are the facts of the two cases which we have mentioned above. "The child of the first accused threw some water on some salt, weighing three *tolas* (about two ounces!) that lay in a pot, and the mother, with that thrift which characterizes native housewives of the poorest classes, in these days of burdensome taxation and dear salt, dearer than gold in the native eye—boiled it down to save the salt from being completely melted away. The second bought some dirty salt, and refined it. Both were perfectly innocent of the existence of the law which holds this process, miracle of miracles, to be offensive, and punishable by fine and imprisonment!" Comment on such a decision is superfluous. Fortunately the case was taken before the High Court of Bombay. Still more fortunately it came under the review of that most humane of Indian judges, Mr. Justice Birdwood. In delivering judgment, he said:

"The magistrate does not find that the salt was originally contraband. On the contrary, he distinctly says that there is no proof that the first accused separated from the earth the three tolas of salt found in her house. And there is nothing to show that her own story is not true. She says that her child poured some water into the pot in which she kept her salt, thus melting it, and that, not wishing to lose the salt, she put the brine on the fire and evaporated the water, thus producing dry salt. The heating of the brine was certainly a 'process' by which the salt was 'separated from brine,' and fell, therefore, within the definition of 'manufacture' contained in section 3 (*g*) of the Bombay Salt Act, 1890. But in the circumstances of the case, a fine of Rs. 10 with eight days' rigorous imprisonment in default of payment was excessive and wholly disproportionate to the character of the offence. (See also our judgment in Criminal Reference No. 132 of 1890 of this day's date). We reduce the fine to one anna, and award one hour's imprisonment in default of payment of the fine. Any sum levied from the accused in excess of one anna to be refunded.

"In the case of the second accused, his lordship said: The accused bought some dirty salt in the bazaar, and in order to clean it dissolved it in water, which she boiled after removing all particles of dirt from it. She thus obtained some clean dry salt. The process by which the salt was separated from the brine falls within the definition of 'manufacture' contained in section 3 (*g*) of the Bombay Salt Act, 1890; and as the accused had obtained no licence to manufacture salt under section 11, her act is punishable under section 47. But in the circumstances of the case, the fine of Rs. 15, with ten days' imprisonment in default, appears to us to be excessive and wholly disproportionate to the character of the offence, especially as the Act has only come into force recently and contains a new definition of the word 'manufacture' which will apparently convert into crimes some perfectly innocent practices connected with the use of salt for domestic purposes. I reduce the fine to eight annas, and award one day's simple imprisonment in default of payment of the fine. Any sum levied from the accused in excess of eight annas to be returned."

It may be hoped that the attention of Parliament will be called, with a view to its speedy amendment, to the law under which such acts as those described above are capable of being treated as *criminal offences*.

A FAMINE-STRICKEN DISTRICT IN EASTERN BENGAL.

WE take from the columns of the *Statesman* of Calcutta the following moving picture of what, five weeks ago, was happening in one of the districts in Eastern Bengal:

GREAT DISTRESS IN FURREEDPORE.

(FROM OUR CORRESPONDENT.)

FURREEDPORE, December 7.

I have no desire to be sensational; in fact, there is no necessity for miscolouring, for I assure you the story of the reality of the present condition of the mass of the people about here cannot possibly be exaggerated. The poorest of the villagers are actually starving, and those who are but little better off in worldly goods must be in a like strait. The former have nothing but what they receive in charity to subsist on, and the latter have scarcely an ordinary meal during the twenty-four hours. The distress is severest in the thannas of Talna, Ainpore and Maksudpore. I travelled through those localities recently, and frequently I came across men, women, and children who were nothing better than skeletons. In their efforts to migrate from their famine-stricken villages, many had fallen by the roadside from sheer exhaustion, resulting from long fasting, and they lay begging of the passers-by for a morsel of food. Children are the greatest sufferers; the older skeletons were pitiable enough, but their emaciated little frames were heartrending to behold. I have not yet heard of any actual deaths from starvation, but these cannot now be long delayed. Many deaths have however occurred, from diseases which can be attributed to starvation and exposure. This is the third year that the crops have failed in this locality, and the poor villagers have been unable to hold out longer against the recurring loss. In the middle of the year high hopes were entertained of returning prosperity, for the crops promised a splendid harvest; but the heavy floods of August dispelled the gladdening prospect, and, since then, the poorest of the people have had to exist as best they could. There was no chance of raising another crop of paddy after the floods subsided, so those of the ryots who could still obtain credit made an effort to grow *rye* and *kalai*. The crops of these cereals that had been raised had almost ripened for harvesting when, on the 3rd instant, locusts descended on the fields, and devoured them for miles. The last hope of the ryots has been dispelled, and as they have no money, and the *mahajuns* will make no further advances or allow them credit for grain or the necessaries of life, they too must soon perforce join the ranks of the starving. The outlook here is a serious and painful one, and it is fervently to be hoped that the Government will adopt prompt measures to relieve the impending distress—rather, I should say, the distress which has already set in and threatens serious proportions. I have restrained myself in writing lest it might possibly be inferred that I have exaggerated. Believe me, matters are even worse than I have stated; many of the people are already suffering the horrors of famine. The distress is extending, and unless relief measures are adopted promptly hundreds will die from want and starvation.

PETITIONS TO PARLIAMENT.

INDIAN COUNCILS AMENDMENT BILL.—IN FAVOUR.

Inhabitants of Croydon, in public meeting assembled on the 14th October, 1890; W. H. S. Aubrey, chairman; (Mr. Sidney Herbert)	1
Inhabitants of Taluga Gotha (Mr. Bradlaugh) [App. 4]	77
,, Taluga of Surajpoor (Mr. Bradlaugh)	112
,, the city of Lucknow ,,	112
,, Simla (Mr. Bradlaugh)	259
,, Tinnevelly and South Arcot (Mr. Bradlaugh)	716
,, Thannah, Ghatal, Garbeta, and Chandrakona, (Mr. Bradlaugh)	1,712
Inhabitants of the city of Lucknow (Mr. Bradlaugh)	230
,, Amritsar (Mr. Bradlaugh)	857
,, Vinyab ,,	786
,, Azamgarh ,,	75
,, ,, ,,	72
,, Lachirampur, Kisundaspur, etc. (Mr. Bradlaugh)	72
,, Vinyab (Mr. Bradlaugh)	230
,, The Punjab (Mr. Bradlaugh)	714
,, Taluga of Amila (Mr. Bradlaugh)	95
,, Amritsar (Mr. Bradlaugh)	908
,, Ludhiana (Sir Charles Forster)	2,132
Total number of Petitions, 18—Signatures	9,160

THE DARK SIDE OF BRITISH RULE IN INDIA.

(*Concluded from page* 20.)

have been had another mode of carrying it out been adopted. If the authorities had worked through and with Indian agency, ten-fold more good might have been done. But no good will be done for India in a real sense so long as the leading members of the Government are penetrated with the spirit of one among them who, two years ago, said to the present writer, with bitter scorn of the Indian people: 'What is there that they know which we don't know a great deal better?'

'From the foregoing it is abundantly clear that the general poverty of the country, which we so much deplore, has its origin in this lamentable prostration of its entire industrial system. On a broad survey of the situation, we find, extending all over the field, (1) *an industrial depression*, so acute and so extreme as to be rapidly verging on a condition of *industrial paralysis*; and (2) *an industrial deadlock*, so serious that, unless removed and terminated by timely action, it threatens to render any amelioration of the present position practically impossible.

'(1) *Industrial Depression*:—All our industries are in distress, and the whole system has come to rest on a false and non-economic basis,—the industrial worker working all round for little more than a bare living. The Ryot drives his plough, the Kumbhar turns his wheel, the Koshti is busy at his loom, the Teli at his press. But, though working all day, they earn little beyond their daily bread; they are plodding without incentive to work, without nerve and without hope: there is no spur to industry, no stimulus to self-reliant activity, no enterprise to make success sure. The industrial classes still exist, but are disheartened and dispirited, knowing not how to help themselves, and hold their own, as against the pushing, go-ahead foreigner, and feel as if condemned, by the weakness of their position, to stand by and look on, while he is vigorously *exploiting* the field, which by right of birth is their own. Nor is this all.

'There is, besides, (2) an *Industrial Deadlock* of an alarming nature under present circumstances. All industrial improvements seem effectually barred. No savings can be or are made; and there are no effective motives to saving. No *accumulations* of industrial capital exist in the country, and no new capital accumulates or can accumulate. Credit is low and disorganized, and nothing is done to rehabilitate and reorganize it as an indispensable aid to industrial advance. Hereditary industrial skill is dying away, and there is as yet (except in isolated centres) no serious effort made to promote the technical training of the industrial classes. There is, lastly, no strong industrial organization in the country to help the struggling industrial worker. This being so, little wonder if no new industrial developments are attempted or can be attempted. Old industries are fast collapsing, and no new ones are started. The curtailment of the industrial field is proceeding apace before the advance of the foreigner; large numbers already find themselves without work, and larger still without *sufficient* work. The result is seen in the wretched aggregate out-turn of our national industries—an annual national income barely sufficient for the daily maintenance charge of the country. There are no prudential checks on over-population, and the normal growth of population in ordinary years is violently swept away when famine comes as it does come more frequently than ever it did before. We have thus confronting us the deplorable spectacle of a whole community brought down to a dead low level—the level of a bare and hand-to-mouth subsistence, and struggling and struggling, in vain, in its helpless poverty, to rise from the slough of misery. But there is little cause for surprise in such a situation, when viewed in the light of the difficulties of the industrial worker in India, dwelt upon in detail in the preceding pages.

'*Less and less work for the growing hands and less and less food for the growing mouths*—this sums up our general industrial position, and defines the problem we have to solve. Already forty to sixty millions of our countrymen are condemned "to go through life on insufficient food"; eighty millions and more earn at present only "a fair and diminishing subsistence"; and more than half the adult population of the country has no work to turn to all the year round. In ten years' time, the population of British India will be twenty-five millions more, unless famine happens to relieve the pressure, and the practical question of the immediate future is, How can work and food enough be found for these growing millions?' (*Ibid.*, pp. 67-69.)

There are not wanting patriotic Indians who realise the depths of distress and degradation into which their country has fallen. Nor are there wanting discerning men who see their way out of the depths. India has good and capable men among the sons of her soil to aid in the salvation of their country if only we will give them an opportunity. Those patriots are Reformers to a man. They want the Enlarged Councils, which Mr. Bradlaugh's Bill would ensure, for no other purpose so much as that they may therein press forward their proposals intended to promote the agricultural and industrial revival and progress of their country. Except they have the *locus standi* which the Councils would provide they have none at all, and no heed is taken of what they urge. (*Ex. gr.*, so powerful and widespread an organisation as the Indian National Congress is utterly ignored by the Indian authorities.) It is from a publication issued by one of the Indian Reforming Bodies, the *Sarvajanik Sabha*, of Poona, that I have gathered many of the facts detailed above. More, much more, than I have alluded to, is to be found in this pamphlet. Not only does it contain a statement of the existing evils, but it also contains not a few wise suggestions as to the policy to be pursued in removing the evils. None of these suggestions, however, are likely to be carried into effect, or can possibly bear any fruit, unless those who have faith in them are placed in a position in which they can influence, inform, and thereby awaken, the Government; and, further, be able themselves to put into operation the plans in which they possess so much faith.

Was it inevitable that the country should have been brought to such a depressed and impoverished condition? Was no other course possible than that which the Government has taken? Was it within the power of the authorities to prevent decay and to promote prosperity? Considering the professions in which we habitually indulge as to the mysterious dispensations of Providence having placed the destinies of India in our hands, and our one object in staying there being for the benefit of the people, it is little short of a crime that such questions can be asked. Being asked there is but one answer to them. The writer of the second article in the *Sarvajanik Sabha's Journal*—an article I have not been able to allude to in this Letter, an article fully as powerful as that from which I have made some most pertinent and powerful citations,—truly remarks: 'If the British Government in India had done in time for our industries and our industrial classes half of what the National Government of Germany did, under parallel circumstances, to safeguard the growth of German industries after the close of the War of Liberation,

when Germany stood to England and other stronger countries in much the same economic relation as India does now to the competing world, the economic problem with us, in its present alarming features and dimensions, would, in all probability, never have arisen.' For the distressful India of to-day we have no one to blame but ourselves. We cannot lay the blame on circumstances. We are despotic. We have moulded these circumstances as we would. We cannot blame the people; we have not allowed them to have any share in the administration: we have been most careful to shut our ears to counsel from them. Heedlessly, thinking more of England and of Englishmen than of India and of Indians, we have exploited a land which, as guardians, we ought to have nurtured into a prosperity unknown in any halcyon days of the past.

Sir, it rests with the House of Commons, that is, with you and your colleagues, whether the deplorable, the awful, state of things in India described in this Letter, the grinding and torturing poverty of so many millions of our fellow-subjects, shall longer continue without any efforts being made to prevent them. A continuance of the present mode of administration will intensify and increase those evils. Only by a change, and such a change as is recommended in the measure which Mr. Bradlaugh hopes may be read a second time on January 28th, can the sorely-needed reforms be carried out.

A new life needs to be breathed into the dry bones, the lifeless body, of the autocratic Service which now rules India so admirably, 'according to Cocker', but not according to humanity and enlightenment. One of the ablest and most patriotic of Indians of this generation (Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee), in a speech recently delivered at Croydon, has plainly and unmistakeably shown the need for a new departure. Addressing a large audience gathered to hear of India's needs, Mr. Bonnerjee said:—'You know the Government of India has been, and naturally has been from the beginning, a government of experiments. When the English people first went there, and tried to understand the people and govern the country, their work was, more or less, a work of experiments. Various experiments were from time to time tried, until the year 1861, when the experiment on which the system of government which at present obtains in India is based was hit upon. From 1861 to the present time is a period of about thirty years, and the experiment to which I have referred has had full time to develop itself. But I think that any one who has paid the slightest attention to the Government of India knows that it has not been a success, and even the India Office feels that it is necessary that some new experiment should be determined upon. Our idea of what this new experiment should be, differs from that of the permanent officials. We want the one which Mr. Bradlaugh, whom in India we are proud to call the Member for India, has brought before the House of Commons in his India Bill, and which he will again produce when the House next meets.'

It is absolutely hopeless to expect that adequate reform in the direction needed will come from the India Office. The officials in the Palace overlooking St. James's Park seem to have entirely forgotten that they occupy the position of a guardian to the Indian people, that they constitute a Court of Appeal. Lord Cross and his colleagues, with their subordinates, rather regard themselves as a registering body existing only for the purpose of sanctioning what is done by the Viceroy and his Council in India. That is, so far as the Indian population is concerned. The late Sir Louis Mallet who was, for many years, Permanent Under Secretary of State for India, has left it on record that the India Office authorities are anxious NOT to know the real facts connected with the condition of the Empire and of its people. The words in which he stated this are of the most positive character, are absolutely startling in the light they throw upon the ruling idea in the India Office.

'If,' said Sir Louis Mallet, 'there is any one thing which is wanting in any investigation of Indian problems, it is an approach to trustworthy and generally accepted facts. There is hardly a subject on which the best authorities do not absolutely disagree as to the fundamental facts. I could mention the most startling incidents, but they must be present to the minds of all of us.

'Now, I am compelled to say that, since I have been connected with the India Office, *I have found just as strong a repugnance to the adoption of*

ANY ADEQUATE MEASURES FOR THE COLLECTION OF A COMPREHENSIVE AND WELL-DIGESTED SET OF FACTS AS TO THE RECOGNITION OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES.

'The only occasion on which I had the misfortune of encountering

THE VEHEMENT OPPOSITION OF SOME MEMBERS OF COUNCIL,

for whose opinions and experience I have the most unfeigned respect, was in my advocacy of Dr. Watson's proposals for an Industrial Survey.'

As it was when Sir Louis Mallet wrote, so is it now. In addition to the normal inertia of a Department—no soul to save, no body to be kicked: not controlled by Parliament even as are all the other Departments. Why should it do anything?—there is in the India Office a feeling which considers it very 'bad form' for any person to show himself zealous above his fellows in anything. While, as for reform, it is not recognized that there is any need for reform.

A distinctly lower and less honourable tone has been introduced into the principles of our rule during the Secretaryship of Viscount Cross. In times past, for nearly sixty years at least, since the day when the Marquis of Lansdowne, grandfather of the present Viceroy, made a notable speech in the House of Lords, and earlier, our pretence has been that merit in the broadest sense, and not race, should be the sole qualification for service in the Indian administration. Now

all is changed. The Public Service Commission recommended a breach of faith towards the Indian people and the breaking of statutory regulations. Lord Cross accepted the recommendation, and now, in the words of one of his Under Secretaries, proficiency in certain English respects is alone to be the passport to high office in India.[1] The exact words used, in the course of correspondence in the middle of 1890, with the Civil Service Commissioners, were these :—

> 'The Civil Service must, ALWAYS, *be essentially* ENGLISH *in character*.'
>
> The Secretary of State 'could not consent . . . . to any change of system likely to prevent the Government of India from obtaining the most highly-qualified ENGLISHMEN.'

Aforetime—*fifty-seven years ago*—a higher and nobler note was struck. These were the terms employed in the Act of 1833 :—

> "NO NATIVE OF THE SAID TERRITORIES nor any natural-born subject of his Majesty resident therein, SHALL, by reason only of his religion, place of birth, descent, or any of them, BE DISABLED FROM HOLDING ANY PLACE, OFFICE, OR EMPLOYMENT UNDER THE SAID COMPANY.'

Thirty-three years ago, in a Proclamation by the Queen, surpassed, for loftiness of diction, highest humanity, and noble purpose, by no other document issued during her reign, the statutory declarations were, in effect, reaffirmed. Lord Cross, apparently, has no more respect for the plighted word of his Sovereign than he has for the authority of Parliament. He has overridden the one and rejected the other. Rules framed under the Act of 1870 opened ANY OFFICE IN INDIA to the Indian people.

It has been left to Viscount Cross, now that the Indian people are well-fitted to share in the highest administration of their own land, to declare that an ignoble and selfish policy shall take the place of the noble, just, generous, and humane policy so worthily enunciated. The Secretary of State is altering for the worse the basis of our rule in India, and—marvellous to relate—the Imperial Parliament allows him to do so unrebuked, although in what he is doing he is defying a statutory decree which was reiterated and emphasized in 1858 by the Queen. The things done and the things being left undone at this moment in connection with India are fraught with most serious peril to the land and to its people,—and to British supremacy.

In spite of all statutory and Royal proclamatory promises it is still the fact that the Indian people are—except in the profession of the law—denied all opportunities of satisfying the proper ambitions which many possess. The country is thus deprived of the knowledge and experience they would make available. The army affords no scope for the martial scions of princely and noble houses. When a request is made that, in honour of the Commandership of the Bombay Army of H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught, an Indian Sandhurst should be founded on voluntary gifts, the Government of India peremptorily snub the proposal and refuse their sanction.

Only in the Government service—ruled despotically as is India—is there reasonable scope for the exercise of ability. In no single position of authority and power is an Indian to be found. Not because there are not men equal to the position. There are able men in plenty. The position in India to-day is as if in all the countries of Europe save Russia, not a single man was considered fit for any administrative position beyond the sub-Prefectship of a Provincial district ! By this parallel it is easy to understand how the pousta must be working among the capable classes, sapping every noble quality of mind and heart. Let me put the matter a little more clearly. Suppose that Germany, France, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Spain and Portugal, Norway and Sweden, Denmark, and the

[1] Lord Cross, in his despatch of October 18, 1889, on the Report of the Civil Service Commission, and subsequent documents, echoing the remarks of Lord Dufferin's Government, says: 'The importance of recruiting' the Covenanted Civil Service 'with reference to the maintenance of English principles and methods of Government cannot be over-rated'. (Para 25.) Therefore, 'simultaneous examinations are altogether inadmissable'. What is just and right towards the people of India, what has been promised again and again almost time out of mind, give place to 'English principles and methods of Government'. That these 'principles and methods' are not, in every instance, synonymous with justice, recent Indian history affords more than one conspicuous and lamentable instance in proof. Turn from the Secretary of State of 1889 to the Secretary of State of exactly twenty years earlier. Listening to the utterances of the latter one feels one's self in a higher region altogether. Sixty-Nine is incomparably better and nobler than Eighty-Nine. On March 11th, 1869, the Duke of Argyll moved the second reading of the 'East India (Laws and Regulations) Act'. Clause 6 of that measure empowered the Governor-General, under such restrictions and regulations as might be agreed to by the Government at home, to select, for the Covenanted Service of India, natives of India, although they might not have gone through the competitive examination in England. Speaking upon this clause, which he described as 'one of very great importance', 'involving some modification in our practice, and in the principles of our legislation as regards the Civil Service of India', his Grace made the following significant observations: 'It may be asked how far this provision is consistent with the measures adopted by Parliament for securing efficiency in that service ; *but there is a previous, and, in my opinion, a much more important, question which I trust will be considered*—HOW FAR THIS PROVISION IS ESSENTIAL TO ENABLE US TO PERFORM OUR DUTIES AND FULFIL OUR PLEDGES AND PROFESSIONS TOWARDS THE PEOPLE OF INDIA. . . . . With regard, however, to the employment of natives in the government of their country, in the Covenanted Service formerly of the Company and now of the Crown, I must say that *we have not fulfilled our duty, or the promises and engagements which we have made*.' [The italics and small capitals are, of course, mine, alike here and in other instances.—W. D.] The twenty years which have passed since this remark was made do not denote improvement in those qualities upon which, in our dealings with India, we most pride ourselves.

This, then, is the issue of the elaborate and costly inquiries of the Public Service Commission, of its Recommendations, of the Observations of Provincial and Supreme Governments, and of the prolonged deliberations of the Secretary of State in Council :

> *The People of India are, so far as the Public Service of their country is concerned, placed in a worse position than they were before the Commission was appointed, to remedy which bad position the Commission was appointed; the evidence taken has been ignored, and, though there is an appearance of 'keeping the promise to the ear', it is not even so kept, while it is ruthlessly 'broken to the hope'.*

It is only with the Indian people, among all the peoples that constitute the wide-spread and multi-populated British Empire, that such a Reactionary Policy would be attempted, much less adopted. In English policy no such retrogression is tolerated. A step once taken is maintained. It remains to be seen whether even the people of India, in view of the promises made in 1833, repeated in 1858, renewed in 1862, given again in 1867, partially legislated upon in 1870, and, finally, lamely carried out in 1879, will consent that legislation which has been passed, admittedly to place them in a better position, should be ignored—nay, actually, in effect, **WITHDRAWN** ! **Without leave of Parliament, too !**

British Isles—countries which, roughly, represent India in area and population—had been under Foreign Domination for much more than one hundred years, and that—although the boast was frequently made on its behalf that the Dominant Power maintained its position only for the good of the people of Europe, and, further, that education was largely encouraged—there was not (save on the Judicial bench), in a single high civil or military position, nor in any of the administrative Councils, a single German, Frenchman, Austrian, Hungarian, Italian, Spaniard, Portuguese, Norwegian, Swede, Dane, nor Briton, it would be held by us, if we were not interested parties, most emphatically, that it was no answer on the part of the Dominant Power, in reply to complaints, to urge that the subordinate offices were filled by Germans, Frenchmen, and the like. Of course the subordinate offices would be so filled. There is no other way of filling them. Unless the Dominant Power dynamited all the inhabitants of the respective nations named and introduced the masses of their own race things could not be otherwise. *In this respect* Russia does vastly better than Britain. If Armenia could provide a Loris Melikoff to become the right hand of a Czar, so—if our practice were on a par with our pretence—India could provide the Viceroy and his lieutenants with the most worthy and absolutely loyal assistance he and they need. All that the self-gratulations so often heard as to Indians being employed in the Indian Civil Service amount to is this: 'The hewers of wood and the drawers of water' in India are Indians. To such remarks as those given above the patriotic Indian may reply, 'Thank you for nothing. Things could not be otherwise ordered if you wished. The laws of nature—to say nothing of the sentiments of humanity—would not permit of it.'

As for the employment in Civil Establishments of all kinds the following table is eloquent upon the injustice, the cruel wrong, which is done to the Indian people. In 1886 Rx. 11,726,148 was paid in salaries in India in these proportions:

Race.	No.	Amount per head.	Total.
1. Europeans	7,991	R 6,756 per annum	Rx. 5,398,701
2. Eurasians	5,347	„ 1,432 „	767,771
3. Indians	119,514	„ 465 „	5,559,676
	132,852		Rx. 11,726,148

When examined the figures show that more than half of the Indians, 61,576 exactly, receive less than Rs. 250 (R. at 1s. 6d.= £18 15s. 0d. *per annum* ! ! !). Less than five hundred Indians (out of a population of 207,000,000) get a salary of more than Rs. 5,000 (=£375) a year, while there are 3,038 Europeans in a better position. There are forty Indians receiving from Rs. 10,000 (=£750) to Rs. 20,000 (=£1,500) per annum, two receiving from Rs. 20,000 (=£1,500) to Rs. 30,000 (=2,250), three receiving from Rs. 40,000 (=£3,000) to Rs. 50,000 (=£3,750), and one receiving Rs. 50,000 (£3,750). Meanwhile, in the four classes named, there are nearly five hundred Europeans. Had legislative and other promises been kept the proportions would, by this time, probably, have been reversed, with infinite advantage to the prosperity of the country and with no detriment to its administrative efficiency.

Will you, if unconvinced, by what I have written, that reform is terribly and urgently needed, at least look into the matter for yourself? My facts are undeniable. Certainly, they cannot, in all candour and honesty, be denied from the Treasury Bench, as they are founded on official documents. Sir John Gorst will, if he cares to take the trouble, find proof for all I have said in his own office. My reasoning from the facts may, by some, be considered open to question, although to me it seems unassailable. But, I pray you, give the matter your consideration, and, for the sake of the suffering, semi-ruined masses of our great Eastern Empire, ensure that the Imperial Parliament shall pay some heed to this truly Imperial peril, and give to the people some power to save themselves from destruction. We have not only refused ourselves to save them: we have plunged them into ever greater and greater misery.

The writing of this Letter has been, to me, an exceedingly painful task; the performance of the duty has been one of both mental and physical pain. It is no pleasure to me to appear to be taking away any merit which may belong to the achievements of my own countrymen in India. Of the good intention of the rulers and administrators of India no one can have a moment's doubt. Only there is this serious drawback: we determine to do everything for the people, instead of training and trusting them to labour for themselves. In presence of the suffering which even now exists among vast numbers of our fellow-subjects, and in view of the disasters which are impending and which must come, bearing great woe to millions of Indians, I could not remain silent. If it has been painful to speak, it would have been more painful to keep silent. India is not receiving from England one tithe of the attention its great problems deserve. India is not so well-governed as it might be and could be. No country can be said to be well-governed in which EVERY office of position and influence is filled by a foreigner, although, as the products of education and experience, there are hundreds of men fully fitted to occupy three-fourths of those offices. Lord Macaulay forecasted the condition of things which has now arisen in these memorable words:

'The destinies of our Indian Empire are covered with thick darkness. It is difficult to form any conjecture as to the fate reserved for a state which resembles no other in history, and which forms by itself a separate class of political phenomena. The laws which regulate its growth and its decay are still unknown to us. It may be that the public mind of India may expand under our

system till it has outgrown that system; that by good government we may educate our subjects into a capacity for better government, that, having become instructed in European knowledge, they may, in some future age, demand European institutions. Whether such a day will ever come I know not; but never will I attempt to avert or to retard it. Whenever it comes, it will be the proudest day in English History. To have found a great people sunk in the lowest depths of slavery and superstition, to have so ruled them as to have made them desirous and capable of all the privileges of citizens would indeed be a title to glory all our own. The sceptre may pass away from us. Unforeseen accidents may derange our most profound schemes of policy. Victory may be inconstant to our arms. But there are triumphs which are followed by no reverses. There is an empire exempt from all natural causes of decay. Those triumphs are the pacific triumphs of reason over barbarism; that empire is the imperishable empire of our hearts and our morals, our literature and our law.'—*Speech of July* 10, 1833.

It is a consideration of the things mentioned in foregoing pages, and of others like them, which has wrung this communication from my heart. I pray, in behalf of the voiceless multitudes of our Indian fellow subjects, that I may not have written this Letter wholly in vain; but that to those voiceless multitudes some amelioration of their sad condition may be ensured by the attention to their affairs of a few members of your House. That amelioration will be begun if the measure of Council Reform now before you becomes law. The Reform Bill of 1832 has proved itself to be the parent of a great host of reforms of all kinds in the United Kingdom. So, it is certain, in like manner will the Indian Reform Bill of 1891, or of some other year (for reform is inevitable), prove itself to be the Mother of Many Improvements, chiefly for India, but from the advantages of which even the British Isles will, in the long run, reap greater gains than they can from the present pousta-administering, autocratic, and terribly cruel, system.

I am, Sirs,
Your faithful servant,
WM. DIGBY.

INDIAN POLITICAL AGENCY,
25, CRAVEN STREET, CHARING CROSS, LONDON.
January 9, 1891.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE ANOMALIES OF THE ANGLO-INDIAN LAW. SLAUGHTER OF KINE.

To the Editor of "INDIA."

Sir,—Your correspondent, G. L. M., has very ably pointed out the invidious distinctions which the Anglo-Indian law makes between the ruling class and the ruled, and I take the liberty of bringing to your notice one other instance. It is of much more importance than all the instances cited by G. L. M. It entails a chain of most mischievous consequences and affects the Indian nation severally and collectively from a material point of view, and also animates and infuses the feelings of a very large majority of Her Majesty's Indian subjects.

India is admittedly an agricultural country. Milk and butter are the chief nutritious articles of its people's diet. Plough cattle are an indispensable necessity for the Indians. Oxen are almost the only plough cattle used by the Indians. Steam and horses are not used, and their general use for purposes of agriculture, considering the extreme poverty of the people, is out of the question. Anything which reduces the number of oxen available for the agricultural purposes of the people, enhances their value much beyond the means of the people, or diminishes the sources of the chief dietary requisites of the people, is fraught with most undesirable and calamitous results, and ought to be deprecated. It was very apparently from considerations like these, that our ancestors, the ancient Aryan conquerors of India, though they had come from a cold climate, and were not improbably addicted to the use of beef, as thought by the European savants, proscribed its use in India and ensured the protection, multiplication, and improvement of the bovine species by imparting to it a religious sanctity and inculcating sundry other regulations and practices.

The Englishmen in India being simply birds of passage, and having no direct concern with agricultural India, attribute the Indian's veneration for cows to a religious precept only; but they lose sight of the ulterior results which this, like every other Hindu law, was meant to accomplish.

It is too much to hope that the Englishmen in India will cease eating beef for our sake. But they may reasonably be asked, and are justly bound to accede, to exempt the cows from the butcher's knife, which may slaughter only oxen and calves. No doubt the slaughter of oxen and calves will also interfere with the agriculturist's supply of plough cattle, but not so much as the slaughter of cows, which destroys the sources from which oxen and calves can come into existence. Just at present in the chambers of the commissariat department, cows alone, or almost alone, are slaughtered. I have watched with anxiety for some years past, the herds of cattle being led towards the military cantonments by the agents of the beef contractor. I do not recollect an instance in which I saw an ox or a calf included in them. India is an agricultural country. Her male calves and oxen cost more than cows, and unless prohibited from slaughtering cows, the contractor will be a fool to purchase the dearer article.

The British Government in India has introduced close seasons and game laws, and it regulates the meshes of a net. The object is to preserve game and sport, and prevent the extinction of fish. These regulations have been introduced into the dominions of the Princes wheresoever possible. It is passing strange, and extremely disappointing to us, that while the Government is anxious for the preservation of the means of sport and pastime for the members of the ruling class, it should have never considered the desirability of placing a check on the extinction of the bovine species, which is being surely and steadily carried out under its own auspices. That the Government is altogether oblivious and neglectful to the needs of its subjects, while it shows so much anxiety for the mere pleasure and luxury of the members of the ruling class, is evident.

I will state here a few instances of the straits to which the country is being reduced.

(*a*) In the country beyond Jehlum a cow and ox are yoked together to a plough, because the Zemindars are not rich enough to purchase two oxen for it.

(*b*) In some cases an ass and a cow form the ploughing pair.

(*c*) A friend of mine, for some time employed as a station master at Khushalgarh, told me of a case in which a man and ass yoked together were doing an apology for ploughing.

(*d*) A greater portion of the Zemindars' indebtedness is due to the purchase of cattle, which have become very much dearer than they used to be in times gone by.

(*e*) Milk and Ghee have become very dear, and few Zemindars can now procure these necessary articles of diet. Very few Zemindars can now keep milch cattle as they used to do in, what they call, happy old days.

In short, there is no doubt that owing to its indiscriminate slaughter in the Government shambles, the bovine species is becoming perceptibly less, and with the breaking up of waste lands, and the reservation of forests, it is doomed to be entirely extinct not long hence, unless some great philanthropist like Mr. Bradlaugh takes up its cause.

If Mr. Bradlaugh can obtain information as to the number of cows, oxen, and calves slaughtered by the commissariat department every year, it will become evident at once that our fears are not unfounded.

You will see, Sir, I hope, that this steady and sure extinction of the bovine species, while gamebirds and fishes are being anxiously taken care of, is most anomalous, and the practice of the Government involves a most invidious distinction between the requirements of the European and Indians. It is hopeless to expect that the Government will do away soon with such anomalies. The Anglo-Indians of the present day inherit the despotic dispositions which the first comers in India contracted from the degenerate native rulers of their days. It is our sense of loyalty which induces us to warn them against the observation of these invidious distinctions, because history tells us that it was this which undermined the stability of the Mogul Empire.

In conclusion, I hope most fervently that the subject of this letter will attract the notice of Mr. Bradlaugh, and that he will think it worth his while to draw the attention of the Government to it in any manner he thinks best.—Yours obediently.

VOX POPULI.

THE SIXTH SESSION

OF THE

INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

THE STORY AS TOLD IN REUTER'S TELEGRAMS.

The sixth Session of the Congress, judging from the telegrams, appears to have been extraordinarily successful. Last year, at Bombay, 1,890 delegates attended. This year there were one thousand, owing to the Congress having decided that, as a deliberative assembly, its proceedings would be better conducted, while the delegates, individually, would carry more weight, if they were confined to a definite number. As a matter of fact, more adherents than ever appear to have attended from all parts of India.

In our next issue our readers may expect an entertaining and graphic narrative of the proceedings from our special correspondent at the Congress. Meanwhile, a very fair idea of what was done may be gathered from the telegrams, which we quote as follows :—

FIRST DAY.

Calcutta, December 26.

The sixth National Indian Congress opened its sittings here, to-day, in a huge pavilion, specially constructed for the purpose. Over 6,000 persons were present, including 1,000 delegates from all parts of India, representing over 4,000,000 people [who may be claimed to have taken part in the elections]. The proceedings were marked by great enthusiasm, and the sitting was attended by many European visitors, including Mr. Schwann, M.P., and Mr. Caine, ex-M.P., Barrow. Amongst the distinguished native visitors were several Rajahs and Muhammadan noblemen; Sir Romesh Chunder Mitter, late Chief Justice of Bengal; the Hon. Krishnaji Lakshman Nulkar member of the Viceroy's Council; and a number of high caste native ladies. Lieutenant-Governor Sir Charles Elliot was unable to attend the meeting, since the orders of the Governor-General definitely prohibited the presence of Government officers.

Welcoming the Delegates.

Mr. Manomohun Ghose, Advocate of the High Court, in opening the meeting, welcomed the delegates, and described the Congress as the inevitable outcome of the generous policy pursued by the British Government in India. Mr. Ghose declared that the movement was not intended in the slightest degree to hamper or embarrass the Government, but to assist it. The Congress only desired that its suggestions should be honestly and sympathetically considered, and its expert aid freely used. Referring to social questions, the speaker held that where the remedy was in the hands of the people it was not wise to invoke the intervention of the Government. As the Congress consisted of members of many different nationalities and creeds, it was not advisable that it should concern itself with questions involving delicate issues. Precipitate or inconsiderate action before the creation of a healthy public opinion, was apt to retard, not advance, progress.

The President's Address.

Mr. Pherozeshah Mervanji Mehta, member of the Bombay Legislative Council, then delivered the Presidential address, and reviewing past history, claimed that the speeches in the House of Lords on the Indian Reform Bill set at rest the question of the loyalty of the movement and the peaceful character of its aims. He quoted a letter from Lord Randolph Churchill as a proof that the constitutional aims met with the approval of all parties. The Congress claimed to represent the thinking portion of Indian subjects, a section which was annually increasing and, being educated, was best able to assist the Government. If the masses were capable of giving articulate expression to their political demands, then the time had arrived for consultative Councils [and representative institutions, but not Councils with power to outvote or overthrow the Government].

Mr. Bradlaugh's Bill.

The President strongly urged the adoption of the elective principle with regard to nominations to the Indian Council as embodied in Mr. Bradlaugh's amendment to Lord Cross's Bill, and he appealed to the Viceroy, as the illustrious bearer of a historic name, to watch the movement with generous sympathy, and to preside over the march of events with timely, provident statesmanship. In conclusion, Mr. Mehta added: "Our Congress asks but to be allowed to show pitfalls, and to join the blessing which England will as surely earn as there is an Eternal that maketh for righteousness. I appeal to all true Englishmen not to let the prayer of a rising, growing, and hopeful nation prove in vain."

SECOND DAY.

The second day's sitting of the Congress was devoted to the consideration of the various resolutions submitted. The proceedings were conducted with calm deliberation and in perfect order, the speakers displaying an anxious earnestness to lay stress upon their intense desire to treat vexed questions in a manner likely to conciliate the Government without sacrifice of principle. A notable feature was the variety of race and creed represented by the speakers, who embraced Hindus and Muhammadans, Parsees and Christians, and spoke both in the vernacular and in English.

The Bengal Government having notified through all the local papers that, under orders from the Government of India, the presence of Government officials, even as visitors, was not advisable, no officials attended, and even the European visitors to Calcutta, in deference to the apparent wishes of the Government House, were similarly absent.

The Reform Bill now before Parliament.

The first resolution adopted was a petition to both Houses of Parliament to pass Mr. Bradlaugh's Bill, framed on Lord Cross's Indian Councils Amendment Act, whereby a portion of the members of the Viceroy's Legislative Council should be elected, the Viceroy deciding to whom the Franchise should be given, and providing safeguards for the protection of mincrities.

Mr. Lalmohun Ghose, in moving the resolution, urged all classes to treat the measure in a generous spirit, and said granting the franchise to however small a percentage of the population would tend to raise the self-respect of the people by imposing a sense of responsibility.

Mr. Shurfuddin, a Muhammadan barrister, urged that influence should be brought to bear upon the Secretary of State's Council, to bring that body into line with the India of to-day.

Re-affirmation of Resolutions of Previous Congresses.

After the reaffirmation of the various resolutions of previous Congresses, Mr. Caine moved and carried, amid great enthusiasm, a petition to the House of Commons to restore the right formerly possessed of bringing forward Indian grievances before the Speaker leaves the chair on the introduction of the Indian Budget.

Local Option in the Drink Traffic.

The last resolution adopted urged local option in excise matters, a subject apparently regarded as of the highest importance by orthodox parties.

A SOCIAL REFORM INTERLUDE.

Sunday, December 28th, was a *dies non* in the political assembly. Members of the Congress and others, to the number of over one thousand, were granted the use of the Congress Pavilion in which to meet and discuss social reforms. Such a courtesy as this was the utmost which the Congress could show to proposals of social reform on which the people are by no means unanimous. The loan of the Pavilion, however, shows that the political reformers as a whole are not merely willing, but are anxious, that the social reforms should be discussed and fully considered. Reuter's telegram on the Sunday's work runs thus :—

An interesting conference of sympathizers with Social Reform was held in the Congress Pavilion to-day, at which over a thousand persons, representative of all castes, were present.

The Madras delegates took a prominent part in the proceedings, and much excitement prevailed between the orthodox and the reformers. The latter, in their speeches, skilfully quoted the Shastras, or religious precepts, in support of their position, urging that the reforms advocated were, in fact, a return to primitive teachings instead of an innovation.

Dr. Mohendra Lall, who presided, chiefly confined his speech to the evils of the early marriage system, to which he attributed physical decadence and intellectual deterioration.

Mr. Norendro Nath Sen (Editor of the *Indian Mirror*, a powerful daily paper published in Calcutta) argued that social advance should march with political progress, and declared that the reforms demanded were not thrust on the people by the Government, as was erroneously supposed, but were supported by the teachings of the Vedas.

Ex-Dewan Raghunath Row (lately Prime Minister of Indore State) held that the Hindu law and sacred writings nowhere justify the existing practice of infant marriages. He said that all classes having realised the paramount need of reform, the time was past for mere academical consideration, and the granting of political enfranchisement would be useless without social improvements.

After the matter had been exhaustively treated on both sides, the Conference unanimously resolved that the celebration of marriage rites should be postponed till the age of twelve years in the case of girls and of eighteen for boys, and the conclusion of the marriage to the ages of fourteen and twenty respectively, the Reform Association pledging itself to carry this out.

A resolution was also passed to the effect that imprisonment in the execution of decrees for the restitution of conjugal rights should be abolished, such coercive process not now receiving the sanction of any enlightened State.

In the debate on a resolution discountenancing marriages between men older than fifty years with girls below twelve years, the native speakers supported the proposal on the ground of the physical and mental suffering entailed by such unions, but the authority of the Sacred Books was not invoked.

Mr. Schwann, M.P., advocated the desirability of the resolution.

THIRD DAY.

December 29th.

The salt tax, permanent land settlement, and the prohibition against the attendance of Government officials as visitors at the Indian National Congress, formed the subjects of resolutions adopted at yesterday's sitting.

THE GRIEVOUS BURDEN OF THE SALT TAX.

Numerous speakers urged that the salt tax bore grievously on the masses whose daily average income was threepence. Owing to fiscal difficulties, the Government, a few years ago, enhanced the tax. The present profit earned by Government was 2,500 per cent. over the cost of manufacture. It was pointed out that the financial position having now greatly improved, and the rise in the exchange having added two and a-half millions to the revenue, the necessity for the continuance of taxation specially oppressive to the poorest classes, no longer existed. It was, therefore, resolved to petition the Viceroy for a reduction of the tax.

A PERMANENT SETTLEMENT GREATLY NEEDED.

The extension of permanent settlement to all temporarily settled tracts of land where the condition prescribed by the Secretary of State for India in 1862 and 1865, had been since fulfilled, was unanimously agreed upon, it appearing that the ryots abstained from making improvements, fearing an increase of the rents in consequence of the unsettled tenure, the result being loss of revenue and dissatisfaction.

INDIGNATION AT GOVERNMENTAL INTERFERENCE.

The sitting concluded with an indignant protest against the action of the Bengal Government in prohibiting, by circular, the attendance of officials at the Congress, even as spectators.

Mr. Manomohun Ghose denounced the step as deplorable, unworthy of Englishmen, unstatesmanlike, and a confession of weakness.

Mr. George Yule, President of the Congress in 1888, doubted if the circular correctly set forth the Viceroy's views, it being opposed to the policy of the Government of India in the past. Probably its issue was due to a blunder on the part of a subordinate official. If it was deliberately issued, the action of the present Viceroy was one of gratuitous insolence to a body of men whose chief characteristics were their devotion to their Queen and their country.

FOURTH DAY.

December 30th.

THE NEXT CONGRESS TO BE HELD IN ENGLAND.

The Congress held its final sitting to-day, when it was decided to hold the next Indian session at Madras or Nagpur in 1892, and to send no fewer than one hundred delegates to hold a Congress in England in 1891. This latter resolution was moved by a high caste Hindu, and supported by no less than thirteen others from all parts of India, the mover declaring that the mere going to England was not a violation of any caste restriction, and that if the requirements of caste were observed in England, which was quite feasible, there was no religious objection whatever to such a Congress. The object of holding a Congress in England was to prove to the British public their loyalty and fitness to be treated by them as fellow citizens.

FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS.

Half a lakh of rupees was subsequently voted on the behalf of the London committee for the purpose of the political propaganda, and a quarter of a lakh for the establishment of a permanent fund.

A LADY DELEGATE.

The most noticeable feature in to-day's sitting was the appearance in the tribune of Mrs. Viadambini Ganguli, a lady doctor and graduate of arts at the Calcutta University, who moved a vote of thanks to the Chairman. This is the first occasion on which a lady delegate has spoken at any Congress, and Mrs. Ganguli's most prepossessing appearance evoked extraordinary enthusiasm.

THE TIMES CALCUTTA CORRESPONDENT'S TELEGRAMS.

These telegrams this year, unlike what happened in previous years, have been few and short, but not one of them has lacked the misrepresentation and mischievousness which have characterised all that Mr. Macgregor (the correspondent in question) has sent to *The Times* regarding the Congress. On December 28 Mr. Macgregor telegraphed as follows:—

The so-called National Congress assembled at Calcutta on Friday for its first meeting. Pherozeshah Mehta, a Parsee barrister of Bombay, was elected president and delivered the opening address. At a second meeting yesterday, four resolutions were adopted; the first expressing approval of Mr. Bradlaugh's Indian Councils Bill; the second reaffirming certain resolutions passed in previous years: the third praying the House of Commons to take up the Indian Budget earlier in the Session; and the fourth calling attention to the excise question.

The third resolution was proposed by Mr. Caine.

So far, the Congress has shown no sign of justifying its existence by discussing the age of consent or any other social questions. The proceedings attract little attention. It is stated that there was a great falling-off in the attendance of delegates on the second day.

This perverse attempt to discredit the Congress was promptly sat upon by the *Pall Mall Gazette*. That paper, in a note in its issue of the 29th, remarked:—

The gentleman who wields the *Times*' thunders at Calcutta, has long been notorious for doing more harm to the progress of English rule in India than any other single entity stuck at the end of a pen. It is good, therefore, to see the snub which is administered to him this morning in the columns where his intolerant and intolerable racial coxcombry is usually allowed to sprawl itself out. The snub is on this wise. Look at the Indian column of the *Times* this morning, and you will see equal prominence of type given to the two items which we print, side by side, below:—

"TIMES" CORRESPONDENT. Calcutta, Dec. 28.	REUTER'S TELEGRAM. Calcutta, Dec. 28.
So far . . . . the so-called National Congress . . . . has shown no sign of justifying its existence by discussing the age of consent, or any other social questions. The proceedings attract little attention. It is stated that there was a great falling-off in the attendance of delegates on the second day.	An interesting conference of sympathisers with social reform was held in the Congress Pavilion to-day, at which over a thousand persons, representative of all castes were present. After the matter had been exhaustively treated, the conference unanimously resolved that the celebration of marriage rites should be postponed till the age of twelve for girls, and eighteen for boys, and consummation to fourteen and twenty respectively.

The Reuter account also remarks on the "calm deliberation," the "earnestness," the "perfect order," and the conciliatory attitude which marked the Congress, and adds:

"A notable feature was the variety of race and creed, represented by the speakers, who included Hindus and Muhammadans, Parsees and Christian, and spoke both in the vernacular and in English."

Really it was a little unkind to show up that Calcutta correspondent so strikingly. But we suppose Mr. Moberley Bell wished to signify the new order of things by a hint to this gentleman to give us less of himself and more of the country and the people to which he is accredited.

On a previous day the correspondent had wired as follows:—

The Bengal Government have issued a circular pointing out that officials ought not to take part in the National Congress, and their presence, even as visitors, is undesirable. Members of the Congress and their organs express great indignation, and talk of appealing to the Secretary of State. However, the circular meets with general approval, and one leading native paper says the thing ought to have been done long since. The Muhammadan *Observer*, the organ of the Mussulmans of Lower Bengal, attacks Mr. Bradlaugh's Indian Councils Bill, and says:

"We willingly admit that the so-called member for India may serve well his own party, but we object, in the very strongest terms, to his posing for what is termed a national movement which has, in reality, no existence. Did he pose for a Hindu congress we should not have a word to say, but we deny in the most emphatic terms, that he represents the Muhammadan community."

COMMENTS OF THE PRESS.

In laying before our readers what the English newspapers have said of the Congress Session we were disposed to do so without note and comment. But so greatly do some of the papers (generally Conservative) err in matters of fact, that, here and there, we are compelled to insert correcting, or explanatory, statements.

(*Daily News*, December 27 : Liberal.)

The sixth National Indian Congress was opened at Calcutta yesterday by an excellent speech from Mr. Mahmohun Ghose. The Congress has already become an established institution, and it attracts more notice and gains more sympathy every year. It is a great representative body of India—much more than the Church Congress at home is representative of the Church. It embodies the opinion of the thoughtful and educated India—the India which Englishmen have created—while at the same time it gives form and definiteness to the opinion it expresses. The Indian Congress is a sign of the times. The Indian Government, wiser in this respect than reactionary advisers at home, may well take note of the opinions expressed, for so far as there is a public opinion in India this Congress is its organ. As Mr. Ghose said yesterday, the object of the movement is not to embarrass the Government, but to asssist it. The men who guide the movement are just those who are most concerned in maintaining and consolidating English ascendancy in the Government, and who would suffer most by any revolution. Nothing but judicial blindness can induce Englishmen who are interested in the welfare of India to regard the Congress with suspicion or alarm. It is happily attracting much attention at home, and we see with satisfaction that year by year Liberal members of Parliament go to India to be present at its sittings. Mr. Charles Schwann, who attends this year, worthily represents the growing interest in Indian subjects among the younger Liberals; while Mr. Caine, who is making himself an authority on Indian matters, is quite sure to have a place in the coming Liberal Parliament.

There are two views of the English government of India. The reactionary view is that we are there for the benefit of England—that is of certain classes of English people who regard India as the happy hunting ground of fortune; the other view is that we are there with a great Providential mission to give peace, good government, and the means of progress to two or three hundred millions of people, That is how our possession of India is regarded by the great mass of honest, hardworking, and conscientious people who form the backbone of the Liberal party. The "classes" may be for making use of India; the masses desire to be useful to India. There is no doubt which view will predominate in the future. The Indian delegates who have lately been putting the case of India before the British people have had no reason to complain of want of sympathy. There is every disposition to insist that in the Indian administration there shall be a fair opening for native Indians, and that more and more they shall be associated with us in the government. There has already been a very great development of municipal institutions; and these schools of self-government, out of which British freedom grew, are already calling forth the self-governing faculty of educated Indians. From these municipal institutions Imperial institutions may grow in time; and the Indian National Congress is the sign and assurance that the educated and commercial classes are already far on the way to fitness for such responsibilities. It is of course only little by little that any approach to self-government can be made in India. The great masses of the people are entirely unprepared for it; and nobody has dreamed of suggesting that they should be in any way entrusted with it. But we have already made a new India. We have poured the life and energy, the learning and arts, the science and the manufactures of the West into the decayed civilization of the East; and have thus raised up a new world. In the old cradle of our race and our civilization, the modern spirit already finds itself at home. The new world, the old civilization pervaded by the modern spirit, look out upon us through the Indian National Congress. We could not suppress it if we would—we ought not to suppress or even to rebuke it if we could. We may speak of it in the words of Schiller, as interpreted by Coleridge—

Often do the spirits
Of great events stride on before the events,
And in to-day already walks to-morrow.

(*Daily Chronicle*, London, December 27 : Liberal.)

The sixth National Indian Congress was opened yesterday at Calcutta, and from the size of the gathering and the influential position of the delegates, and the fact that they represent several millions of the Indian populations, the proceedings will be watched with keen and sympathetic interest in this country. The speakers who took part in the opening ceremonies vied with each other in their expressions of loyalty towards the British Government, and whatever may be thought of their proposals for the better government of India, they are entitled to be received with respect and carefully considered by those who are responsible for Indian administration. One of the points insisted upon yesterday was that the nominations to the Indian Council should be elective. It is noteworthy that the members of the Congress are drawn entirely from the educated classes of the native races, while they at the same time claim that if the masses of the different nations could make their opinions and wishes articulate they would be in favour of the demands which the Congress has put forward.

(*Pall Mall Gazette*, December 27 : Liberal.)

"Consultative councils, but not representative institutions." Such was the note struck by Mr. Mehta in his presidental address to the National Indian Congress yesterday. The distinction thus made by Mr. Mehta should go far to reconcile the opponents and the supporters of the movement. On the one hand people ridicule the idea of applying full-blown representative institutions to India. And ridiculous the idea is. But then it is not what the National Indian Congress put forward. All that they ask is a gradual and tentative application of the elective principle. And that is a demand which is entirely reasonable. As for the spirit displayed at the Congress, we are fortunate in having Mr. Caine to represent us there. Some of his future "Letters from India" will doubtless be devoted to his impressions of the Congress.

(*Echo*, December 27 : Liberal-Unionist.)

For better or for worse there is a significant political movement in India. Yesterday the sixth National Indian Congress commenced its proceedings at Calcutta, at which were present over 6,000 persons, including 1,000 delegates from all parts of India. It is reported that the proceedings were marked by great enthusiasm. There are three things connected with these Congresses well worthy of the consideration of Englishmen. In the first place, the Congresses are conducted on the English system. There is a chairman, a committee of management, the moving and seconding of resolutions, with subsequent debates, and the dominance of majorities. And when the Congress is over, an elaborate report is printed and extensively circulated throughout the Indian provinces. This looks like business. It indicates forethought, plan, purpose, and persistency. In the next place, it will be seen that the demands are practical, and not merely theoretical. If the English model is imitated in the machinery of each Congress, the English spirit is emulated in the objects formulated and sought for. The third and equally notable feature about these Congresses is that they increase in size and importance from year to year. These facts or features may be disagreeable to many Englishmen; but they exist, and will have somehow to be met and provided for. There is gradually growing up in India, and particularly in the minds of the most intellectual Indians, a demand for a modified Home Rule. They ask that more Indians shall be nominated to responsible positions; that the elective principle shall be adopted in the selection of some of the members of the Indian Council; and that native opinion shall have some influence in the government of the country. They are moderate in their demands, and moderate in the method adopted to obtain them. There is no menace in their language. They ask nothing that reason does not sanction, and that experience, tempered with wisdom, may not concede.

(*Observer*, December 28 : Unionist without any Liberalism.)

The opening of the sixth National Indian Congress at Calcutta last Friday, was welcomed yesterday in appropriate terms by the *Daily News*. In the course of its remarks it informed the delegates and others that "there are two views of the English government of India." These two views are respectively those of—to put it shortly —"the classes and the masses." The classes want "to make use of India," the masses merely "desire to be useful to India." To the one, it is a Tom Tiddler's ground (this, we admit, is paraphrase, and not *Daily News*), to the others an arena for the display of the moral virtues. The latter, the virtuous theory, is the one in favour with "the great mass of honest, hardworking, and conscientious people who 'form the backbone of the Liberal party.'" What the backbone of the other party must be like, and what the character of the great mass of people who form it, we are left to judge from the fact that their conception of India is directly opposed to that which would come naturally to an honest, hardworking, and conscientious man. So now the Indian National Congress can see for themselves what a mastery of the art of political classification may be attained under representative institutions by a political writer. Another two centuries of the Congress and some Mr. Mamohun Ghose of the future will be able to divide his countrymen into two unequal parts, of sheep and goats, with a hand as unerring as this.

(*Bradford Observer*, December 29 : Liberal.)

Now that the National Congress of India is again in full swing, we are pretty sure to see its opponents in a corresponding state of activity. "Noisy faction," "Ignored by thinking natives of every race," and all the other stale terms of depreciation will be recoined by men like the *Times'* correspondent, who never felt touch with the mind of the native populations in all their lives, and whose numbers can hardly be said to reach the dignity even of a faction. To every Englishman who can exercise a little sober judgment of his own, and, above all, to every Liberal, the short report of Friday's opening proceedings should of itself sufficiently refute any such descriptions of the Indian nationalist movement. A better Constitutional tone, a keener insight into the conditions of success in organized agitation, or a finer sense of moderation, could not have been shown by any popular leaders in England, than was displayed in the speeches of Mr. Ghose and Mr. Mehta. These two speakers each regarding the movement from a separate point, laid down a couple of propositions which every sympathizer with the movement, whether in Great Britain or India, ought to keep fixed in the forefront of his mind. Mr. Ghose appealed to the delegates to avoid particularization as they would a rock of danger, and on no account to be drawn upon the single principle that the opinion of India should be heard in the councils of its Government. And Mr. Mehta declared that that opinion should find its organ, not in responsible legislative bodies, but in assemblies elected by the people to fill the humble office of offering suggestions and making requests. These two propositions, each the natural complement of the other, are invaluable. They concentrate the whole case, in its twofold aspects, into a couple of phrases, both terse enough to stick to any average memory.

(*Morning Post*, London, December 29 : Conservative.)

On Friday last the sixth National Indian Congress opened its sittings at Calcutta in a spacious pavilion specially constructed for the purpose. More than six thousand persons, of whom one thousand were delegates, attended the opening sitting, among whom were numerous European visitors, including one English member of Parliament, Mr. Schwann, as well as Mr. Caine, who came, no doubt, to give continuity to the tradition of the English Radical support which was last year represented by Mr. Bradlaugh. It is needless to say that the proceedings were characterized by the utmost enthusiasm, and it is only fair to add that, from one point of view, at least, the spirit of self-congratulation was not wholly out of place. We refer to the annual increase in the attendance at these Congresses since the first of them was held just five years ago. When Mr. W. C.

Bonnerjee presided over the first of them, in December, 1885, there were less than a hundred persons present, and the proceedings, though afterwards published, were conducted in private. The following year the hon. Dadabhai Naoroji, a gentleman whose name is a sufficient indication of the political quarter to which the Congress looks for support in this country, presided over a gathering of four hundred and thirty delegates, and these were asked to a garden party, though not, of course, in their official capacity, by Lord Dufferin. A further rise in numbers was noticeable at Madras in 1887, and again at Allahabad in 1888, while last year's Congress, held at Bombay, was more successful than any of its predecessors. Five thousand persons assembled, a few lady delegates—whose presence was a pleasing innovation indicative of the progress of Occidental ideas—being among them, and the President, Sir William Wedderburn, pronounced an enthusiastic eulogy on the "just and sympathetic" administration of the Marquis of Ripon, which had so abundantly "fulfilled the national aspirations." The numbers of those present this year being larger than on any previous occasion, the Congress has some right, from the stand-point of figures, to be satisfied with itself. It has, however, been well said that almost anything can be proved from statistics. When one remembers that the delegates present only profess to represent four millions of the inhabitants of India, and that the total population of British India is nearly two hundred and nine millions, without reckoning some sixty millions more for the native States, one realises the exceedingly nugatory character of the claim put forward by these Congresses to be regarded as in any sense national.

But while the Congress is able to point to an increasing annual attendance, it cannot venture to assert that the movement of which it is the outcome is receiving any special favour from the Indian Government. The presence of Government officials having been declared by the Government not to be advisable, none of these attended; and we gather that on the second day of the Congress even the European visitors abstained from attending, in deference to that hint. The fact is, that the attitude of the Indian Government of to-day towards this movement is guided by the spirit which animated Lord Dufferin, and to which he gave expression in November, 1888, in a famous speech denouncing the dangers of certain opinions which have been expressed at these gatherings, and which had received too much encouragement under Lord Ripon's *régime*. We observe, with satisfaction, that the present policy of the Indian Government in this respect has not been without a salutary and sobering effect upon the tone of the Congress, and therefore, as we may reasonably hope, upon the directors of the movement. Those who have followed the proceedings at the previous Congresses, and who compare them with the accounts of the present gathering, will be struck with the conciliatory attitude which the "Congress Wallahs" have adopted. There is a notable absence of bounce and bluster, an almost exaggerated profession of anxiety to avoid topics which might give offence to the Government or might provoke religious or racial antagonism between the diverse creeds and nationalities of India. Possibly this is due, to some extent, to the presence of the English Gladstonian member of Parliament, who may well have given the leaders of the movement a hint that his party have gained nothing by previous attempts to bully the Government, and that it will be wise—if only for a season—to moderate their tone. Probably, also, the strong protest from the Muhammadan community which was evoked by the meeting of the Congress last year has not been without its effects in moderating the intense desire of the Baboo to glorify himself and his ingenious, but by no means glorious, race at the expense of other races and religions. In substance, however, the Congress still adheres to its previous demands, notably to the introduction of a representative element into the Viceroy's Legislative Council. And at the suggestion of Mr. Caine, who, apparently, does not think that the British House of Commons has got work enough to do, a petition has been voted in that House for the restoration of the right to bring forward Indian grievances in connection with the Indian Budget. It would, on the whole, be rash to assume that the more moderate and concilatory tone outwardly assumed by the Congress indicates a more correct appreciation by that body of its own importance.

As we have already observed, the delegates to these so-called National Congresses profess to represent some four millions of the inhabitants of India. Even if they really did "represent" that number of the population in any but a nominal sense, it is clear, from the figures we have given, that their constituents would be but a drop in the vast ocean of the teeming masses of the Indian population. But can anyone with the slightest knowledge of Oriental life in general, and of British India in particular, imagine for a moment that there is any representation in the sense in which an English Member of Parliament represents an English constituency? To ask the question must, in the judgment of men of Indian experience, be to answer it. But even assuming that there are several millions of natives who have some more or less distinct notion of their own wants and wishes in the matter of the reforms their "delegates" demand, by what right are they dubbed "the people of India"? Since even the most palpable absurdities, if not repeatedly exposed, are often able to obtain, in time, a certain measure of toleration, and even of acceptance, it is necessary, yet once more, to point out the gigantic fallacy which underlies this Indian Congress movement. It is not a "National" Indian Congress, for the simple, but sufficient, reason that there is no Indian nation. Nationalities there are, many and various, each differing from the other in race, in religion, in manners and customs, and all of them more or less antagonistic one to another. To talk of these diverse nationalities as if they constituted one compact, homogeneous and harmonious whole, which could be properly described as "the Indian nation" or "the people of India," is hopelessly erroneous, whether we consider the matter from the ethnical, the linguistic, the religious or the social standpoint. The genesis of the movement is to be found in the ingenuity of the Bengali Baboo place-hunter, who hopes to use English Radical sentimentalism for his own purposes. That personage is to be congratulated upon the measure of success with which he has touched a responsive string; but that he will ever gain any practical benefit from the performance is in the highest degree improbable.

It will be seen that this influential Conservative paper can see nothing else in the movement than the ingenuity of "Baboo place-hunters." In such case how can it be expected that the Conservatives will support the Reform movement? Of course such a creature as a "place-hunter" is unknown in the Conservative Party in Britain! Of course! Of course! To make Tory help impossible, the *Globe* of the same date as the *Morning Post* wrote the following (we must say) really discreditable article:

THE BABOO PARLIAMENT.

The addresses delivered yesterday at the opening of the Sixth "National" Indian Congress appear to have been characterized by a tone of exceptional moderation. Instead of the revolutionary aspirations which have been wont to distinguish these remarkable assemblies, the talk was of a decidedly commonplace sort. England was belauded to the skies instead of being vilified, while supplications for sympathy took the place of menaces of insurrection. Had the Congress movement originally started on these loyal lines, it would have been received with favour by a good many thoughtful Anglo-Indians. They recognise the expediency of providing some safety-valve for the pent-up energies of that growing class who, after receiving a Univerity education, discover that there is little or no market for their attainments. If they fail to secure Government employment, they either devote their talents to scurrilous and disloyal journalism, or sink into commerical clerks on very limited stipends. In both cases their discontent is as keen as abiding, but, instead of seeking about for other openings in life as young Englishmen would do, they expend their choler in abuse of British rule. Naturally, therefore, these disatisfied M.A.'s and B.A.'s performed many curious antics when the first Congress took place. Lord Ripon's sentimental patronage of their class hsd filled their ambitious minds with the idea that England might be frightened by empty talk into handing over the administration of Hindostan to a clique of hungry baboos. This conviction gained fresh strength, too, when Mr. Gladstone proposed, under the pressure of party exigencies, to hand over the administration of Ireland to a crew of needy Irish agitators. If Home Rule was to be given to one part of the Empire, why not to another? Thus spoke the Congress wallahs when their effervescence reached its culminating point, and there were not wanting some English politicians, of the notoriety seeking type, to give them encouragement. But the movement never caught hold of either the Indian classes or masses. As a rule, the aristocracy and plutocracy held studiously aloof from it, while the petty traders and the tillers of the soil went on their own way, without giving the slightest heed to the trumpet tones of exalted "patriotism."

Judging from yesterday's somewhat tame proceedings, the baboo mind has come to the conclusion that England is not to be moved from her purpose of securing the best possible government for Hindostan by flatulent boastings or foolish threats of appealing to Russia. A variety of causes have operated to produce this happy change of attitude. Since the last Congress, the Mahomedans have set their faces dead against the movement, the success of which would, they foresee, place them, the minority, under the control of a majority possessing an antagonistic creed. It is the case of Protestant Ulster and Home Rule with a new face. The Indian Mahomedans know well that they would receive mighty little consideration from a Hidoo *régime*, and they consequently prefer a system of government which holds the scales of justice equally between the majority and the minority. But this revolt of Islam against the Hindoo Home Rule movement might not have produced so much effect had not the sinews of war which kept the agitation going, shrunk away to a lamentable degree. At last year's Congress, the list of subscriptions presented quite a formidable appearance, and there was no end of lofty talk about the "earnestness" of purpose which could produce such a magnificent amount. But the Indian "patriot," like some of the tribe nearer home, is very loth to part with his money. He does not mind putting down his name for a handsome donation; that gets into the papers and looks well. But when it comes to paying up, he is full of ingenious excuses for making default. And so it duly happened in the case in question. The "Indian Political Agency," which had been established in London on a rather expensive footing, soon made bitter complaint of want of funds for salaries and expenses, owing to a large number of subscriptions remaining unpaid. Patriotism, it appeared, had quickly repented of its impulsive generosity on paper, and when a peremptory demand for payment was forwarded to India the native papers entreated the Agency to do its spiriting rather more gently.

The most noteworthy point, perhaps, in the addresss delivered yesterday by the president is his emphatic repudiation of the demand for representative institutions. Up to the present time the Indian "reformer" has always laid claim to that particular boon as the one thing needful to ensure the administration of Hindostan "in accordance with Indian ideas." This merely meant, of course, that the social "reformer," like the penniless Irish agitator, hungered for official pickings, and as this craving was the one "earnest" point in the whole of his programme, the present repudiation promises to extinguish the last spark of spirit in the Congress movement. From some points of view, its total collapse would be a matter for regret. If kept within proper bounds, it might have concentrated native attention on not a few social reforms of pressing urgency. The infant marriage question, the slaughter of kine, the improvement of agriculture, the substitution of commercial for professional education, the abolition of that cruelly unjust impost the salt duty, and the development of once prosperous but now decayed industries, such as the cultivation and manufacture of silk, are among the subjects on which educated native opinion might deliver itself with great advantage to the whole community. We trust, therefore, that a new social movement directed towards such objects as these will arise from the ashes of the now moribund "National Indian Congress."

Yet one more wrong-headed article on the anti-popular side, and we must cease quoting in full. The *St. James's Gazette*, on December 29, thus delivers itself:

THE INDIAN HOME RULERS.

The fortuitous conglomeration of loquacious students, disappointed office-seekers, and embryo revolutionists which has met at Calcutta,

with a Parsee barrister as chairman and Mr. Caine, ex-M.P., as patron, has, at any rate, succeeded in making its voice audible. Its proceedings are reported by telegraph at considerable length, and the meeting of the Indian National Congress is plainly one of the events of the day. For some time past we have heard but little of Indian affairs. The Marquis of Lansdowne seems to have taken the Arabic proverb to heart, which bids a man be careful lest his tongue slit his windpipe. At any rate, the Viceroy says next to nothing about affairs of State; and the machinery of government is moving just now very quietly. The National Congress, therefore, may hope to get an unusual share of the public attention; for although a writer in the *Times* dilates at length on the pacification of Burma, the Congress is really an "Indian affair" of far greater importance. Moreover, in spite of all that has been said and written on the subject, there is still a chance that it may be entirely misunderstood, and that it may do considerable mischief both in England and India.

To a certain extent, of course, these yearly meetings of political aspirants may prove beneficial. There are elements of disturbance in our Indian Empire which are sure to be made more dangerous by repression. Safety-valves for the escape of superfluous energy are highly necessary in India, as in most other countries; and, within moderate limits, Young India may be judiciously allowed to let off waste steam, either through the vernacular press or at these public assemblies, with the best possible effect. But steam that escapes from the safety-valve does not help to drive the engine; and we must be careful to estimate all these fluent speeches and verbose proceedings at a proper value. The members of the National Congress, even though they comprise a variety of races and creeds, do not represent the people of India. The delegates have been chosen—in many cases they have chosen themselves—in a very haphazard way. The great masses of the Indian people, the millions of industrious but ignorant cultivators—ignorant, that is, of book-learning—for whose sake, and at whose expense, we rule India, have never heard of the National Congress, or of Mr. Caine, or even of Mr. Bradlaugh. They know as much about the Calcutta Assembly as they do about the House of Commons; nor are the ideas and aspirations of Mr. Conybeare, M.P., much more foreign to them than those of a smart Bengal barrister who can speak English and read French novels. The *Congress-wallah* "represents" an infinitesimal minority, and, left to himself, he might be allowed to declaim on the rights of man and the example of Hampden without anybody being hurt by it. But the mischief begins when these gentlemen imagine that to get a hearing in England they have only to ally themselves with English politicians of the stamp of Mr. Caine and Bradlaugh. The harm that may be done by political tourists like "Pagett, M.P.," is incalculable. The rising generation of educated natives is already beginning to think that its hope of political advancement rests not on the Government of India, but on party politicians in England. The next lesson will be that the Indian Government is less powerful than the natives of India have been led to suppose; that it may be thwarted and coerced with the aid of the party in opposition in London. An active alliance between the Indian Home Rulers and the mischievous "faddist" party to which Mr. Caine belongs, is quite on the cards; and silly as it would be, it might do a great deal of harm. The leaders of the National Congress are very far from being fools; some of them are exceedingly intelligent; and as soon as they have learnt this lesson they will put it into effect. The result must inevitably be that the difficulty of ruling India will be increased tenfold. The real objects of good government and national progress will be lost sight of, and all the energies of Anglo-Indian Administrators will be required, not for the development of the country's resources, but for the prevention of a general explosion.

There is danger, also, to be apprehended in England. Mr. Caine and his friends go out to Calcutta, or Madras, or Bombay, and see an immense number of Indians—that, we believe, is the appellation preferred by the advanced party—all talking with wonderful fluency and unanimity. Messrs. Caine and Co. straightway infer that they have seen India and heard what the people of India want; and, without touching more than the outside fringe and hem of Asiatic life, they come home and pose as authorities on Eastern matters. India, we are told, demands local option. India will not be happy without a sham imitation of our county councils. The native Indian wants a vote, and a caucus, and other advantages of Western civilization. We have said before, but it cannot be repeated too often, that the great mass of the people care for none of these things. The National Congress represents, no doubt, the aims and aspirations of a large proportion of the English-speaking class; but the English-speaking class may practically be ignored in all questions really affecting the general interests of the community at large. Of course, this educated class has a claim to respect and to fair treatment. For most of its faults its English teachers are mainly responsible; and sometimes, no doubt, these faults are exaggerated. There are numbers of educated gentlemen who are quite as capable of assisting in the administration of public affairs as an average member of the London County Council; and if Lord Cross's India Councils Bill is passed, their services will be utilized. As may be seen, however, from the proceedings at the Congress, Lord Cross's Bill, liberal as it is, is very far from satisfying these ambitious demagogues; and the danger of these Conferences and their travelling patrons is that they may lead people in England to suppose that the Anglicised agitator really represents any considerable body of natives and native opinion, which most emphatically he does not.

The remaining notices we must summarise.

The *Daily News* (December 29) is very sarcastic on Lord Cross. Referring to the Council reform resolution, it says:

But the most important resolution, proposed by Mr. Lalmohun Ghose, was that some members of the Viceroy's Legislative Council should in future be elected, the franchise to be defined by the Viceroy himself. This very moderate and reasonable experiment ought to be tried, if only because its failures would be harmless, while its success would be valuable and encouraging. It must be remembered that the Viceroy's Executive Council, a smaller and much more powerful body than the Legislative, is entirely nominated by the Crown. How Lord Cross construes the responsibility thus imposed upon him may be tested by his recent appointment to one of the most important and influential posts in the Empire. Such a selection as that of a superannuated Railway Commissioner to be the legal member of Council is enough to make the friends of India despair.

The London correspondent of the *Yorkshire Post*, an ex-Indian journalist who has never penned a good word on behalf of the Indian people since his return to this country, says of the leading article in the *Daily News* on December 28:

This kind of gush presumably suits some palates or it would not be written, but it is difficult to believe that even a sentimental Gladstonian brimming over with the milk of human kindness takes it quite seriously. English people may be very ignorant of India, but they are at least able to grasp this cardinal fact that India is a country inhabited by people not of one race, but of many, and that it is precisely the most warlike and manly of the races that are most bitterly opposed to the Congress. To talk of it therefore in any sense as representative of the people of India is absurd. It represents merely a section and that a small one of the great Indian community, and it only represents them in the sense that the Gladstonian caucus represents the people of England—but not even so much.

The *Leeds Mercury* (December 29: Liberal) has faith in Lord Lansdowne: why, it does not state. At the end of an article favouring the movement, it says:

It is unquestionably very desirable that the educated class which, though relatively small, is actually very considerable in numbers, should be prevented from becoming chronically discontented, and if any system of representation on the Indian Councils could be devised which would make them feel that due consideration was secured to their views in regard to public affairs, a good end would have been achieved. We do not doubt that Lord Lansdowne will give his best attention to this complicated problem, with a view to effecting, if possible, such a solution of it as shall give reasonable satisfaction to the educated natives without impairing in any respect the stability and efficiency of British rule in India.

The Tory *Manchester Courier* (same date) is very fierce against the Congress, as the following sentences quoted from its leader shows:

The pretensions of this body of semi-Anglicised Baboos to speak on behalf of the subjects of the Queen-Empress in India appear in some quarters to be treated seriously; and to those who have paid no attention to the subject there is something very imposing in the announcement that there are assembled over a thousand delegates from all parts of India, representing over 4,000,000 of people. We doubt very much whether these delegates represent anyone but themselves—disappointed office-seekers, ambitious lawyers, and editors of vernacular newspapers.

The agitation, such as it is, is confined to the large towns and to certain classes, who are to a great extent out of touch with the mass of their fellow-countrymen.

The Congress speaks in the name of the people of India, yet all its ideas and its aims are contrary to native feeling, and are the result of the veneer of European civilization which the Baboos have acquired. It serves to attract a few wandering members of Parliament and other politicians who imagine that they may raise some useful electioneering cry out of supposed native grievances. To the faddist, to the sentimentalist, to the anti-Imperialist, the Indian Congress is a perfect godsend: to the man of sense, of knowledge, and of patriotism it would be simply ludicrous if it were not that it constitutes a possible source of future danger.

The adoption of the proposals of the Congress would radically alter the conditions under which we at present administer our Indian Empire. We should be admitting the natives into partnership, and in the long run the Council would almost inevitably develop into a Parliament, by whose decisions the Viceroy and the home government would be bound.

It is not notorious that some of the most beneficent reforms in India have been carried out in the teeth of native opposition? Would it have been possible if representative institutions had been in existence to have put down Suttee and other forms of self-immolation?

The *Courier* knows so little of the question it writes about with such dogmatism as to be unaware that the abolition of Suttee was undertaken with the concurrence of the Indians themselves, if not, indeed, on the suggestion of the more enlightened among them. In the same way, infant marriage reform, when it comes, will come from the desire of the people themselves for change. But any statement is good enough, if only it can be used to discredit this patriotic political movement.

The *Birmingham Gazette* (December 29: Conservative) publishes what is, on the whole, a reasonable and not unfair leader. We quote its last paragraph in full. Crowded with fallacies as is the quotation—the worst perhaps being the part for which Lord Salisbury is responsible—no provincial Conservative journal has written with so much general good sense as is apparent in the following:

Lord Salisbury hit the mark when he pointed out in the course of the debate on Lord Cross's Bill that "the elective principle is not an Eastern idea." It is wholly foreign to Eastern modes of government and to Eastern ways of thinking. The people will have to live for many years yet under the discipline of our British rule before they are ready for the freedom which they demand. We are far indeed from scorning the "prayer of a rising, growing, and hopeful nation." Englishmen are not so narrow-idead as to desire to keep their Indian fellow subjects in a perpetual bondage. But they are the responsible rulers of the great Empire. They control the peace and the prosperity of more than two hundred millions of people, and they have to decide what is best for them. What would happen if British rule were withdrawn from India? The "members of many different nationalities and creeds" would rise up in rivalry against each other, and the Empire would be a scene of fury and of bloodshed for generations to come. Now the effect of the proposals favoured by Lord Ripon, Mr.

Bradlaugh, and other prominent pro-native advocates would be to supersede the English rule, and it may well be doubted whether the effect of this would not be as disastrous as its total withdrawal. Lord Cross went far enough in the concessions which he proposed. To go further would have been to invite risks which it is our duty to avert from the people of India. A parent or a guardian does not give the child all it asks for, but only what is considered good and safe. The natives of India are mere children in knowledge of civilized government. Under their own native rulers they have been accustomed to a despotism maintained by brute force. British rule has been a species of autocracy tempered by generosity and mercy. We can point to the enormous strides made by the country in proof of the wisdom of our rule. Such of the people as are educated enough are as loyal to the Queen Empress as her own English subjects. Their fault they show in the National Congress is the, in some respects, creditable one of believing that all their fellow-countrymen are equally loyal and equally alive to the advantages of Her Majesty's rule. It is desirable to give the educated natives the freest possible admission to all forms of civil and military service under the Crown. They will on the whole make good servants, although we doubt whether they would make equally good masters. A mere handful of Europeans cannot with any degree of safety delegate large governing powers to the overwhelming body of natives. The popularization of administrative and legislative authorities must be accomplished gradually. Each concession must follow upon conclusive evidence that the previous one has been wisely used, and none should be so great as to have revolutionary effects. If at any time too much is given we shall only be able to remedy the error by reconquering India.

The *Liverpool Mercury* (December 29: Liberal), as might have been expected, writes with good sense and judgment. Here are some of its principal passages:

The National Congress has become a parliament in form if not in fact, and its proceedings are invariably characterized by conspicuous ability, studied decorum, and respectful moderation in the claims put forward.

The conventions are training grounds for future legislators. The upper classes of India are now as well educated as those of England, and they look forward to a period when they shall have an opening for their intellectual powers in political life. None amongst them are so sanguine as to anticipate Home Rule as understood and existent in our colonies. But they all contemplate such an infusion of the native element into the Government, and so considerable an extension of Indian authority over Indian concerns, as should satisfy the needs of the country and the laudable aspirations of the communities composing it.

In England the advance of native sentiment is viewed with sympathetic favour by Liberals, and even the hostile suspicions of Conservatives are undergoing modification. The European residents of India have constantly resisted the demands of the people, conceiving that the relations between the two should be those of conqueror and conquered; and the Conservatism of these kingdoms responded naturally to the touch of a principle or predisposition which is as old as parties. On the other hand, the yearning after greater freedom awoke an echo in Liberal minds, and by degrees invited association and co-operation.

The opening address of Mr. Manmohun Ghose was statesmanlike in every sentence, and the same description applies to the presidential deliverance of Mr. Mervanji Mehta, member of the Bombay Legislative Council. There is no demand embodied in any programme drawn up which is not strictly reasonable and constitutional.

If there are a thousand delegates reflecting the culture of native India, their assistance ought to be of inestimable value. They know the feelings of the masses, and they are in a position to advise the responsible governors with advantage. If there were disloyal motives behind their action, such evidence as they gave would be open to discredit. But not even the Conservative members of the House of Lords, during the debates last Session on the India Councils Bill, ventured to suggest any purpose other than patriotic as inspiring the agitation. Wise statesmen, sincerely desirous of increasing the strength of the tie binding India to the empire, would gladly avail themselves of the prospect opened by the development of native opinion in the direction of public life.

The *Bristol Times and Mirror* (December 29), the only Conservative daily paper in Bristol, is so vehemently wrong-headed, perverse, and unjust, that it must be quoted in full:

By what must, we suppose, be regarded as a pure coincidence, the sixth sitting of the Indian National Congress coincides, in point of time, with the visit of the Czarewitch to India. The heir to the Russian throne will thus be able to gain a remarkable insight into some of the British methods of governing India. He will note that, for the last six years, an assembly has been allowed to hold its sittings, at which many violent, revolutionary, and seditious sentiments have found expression in words and much outrageous nonsense has been talked. But he will observe that, in this, its sixth year, the tone of the Congress has become studiously moderate, and that its aims and ambitions have dwindled down considerably. This annual conference had its origin in the indiscreet patronage which Lord Ripon chose to give when he was Viceroy, to the aspirations of the Baboos, an over-educated class of superficially clever natives. Lord Ripon, and those who approved of his policy in England, flattered these people to the top of their bent. The sensation caused by the Ilbert Bill controversy has not yet been forgotten. This Bill proposed to allow native magistrates in Bengal to sit in judgment and pass summary sentences on Europeans. The proposal was a direct infraction of all our policy towards India, from first to last; and for this reason, it found supporters among some sentimentalists in England. Then, there were other objectionable propositions, relative to the laws of landlord and tenant in India, and founded on Mr. Gladstone's Irish legislation. The Englishmen who now call themselves downright Home Rulers began even then to argue that if Ireland had this or that benefit conferred on her, there was no reason why India should have it too. Fortunately, Lord Ripon left India with most of his mischievous projects unfulfilled, his place being taken by a wise and strong successor.

It is not to be wondered at that the Baboos should have found means of giving vent to all sorts of grievances, when they found that there were people in England ready to take them at their own valuation. The "National Congress" was started as a kind of Parliament of Indian Home Rulers, the Baboo element being in the ascendant. At these meetings the wildest and most extravagant theories were advanced, and the Baboo found himself at last in a position to show what education had done for him. The grandiloquent term "National," however, given to this movement was never justified. The Baboos were permitted to have their palaver and say their say; but Indians went unconcernedly on their way. Macaulay's biting estimate of the character of the Bengali is still a household word in India, both among Europeans and educated Muhammadans. The more noisy and turbulent the Congresses became, the less attention was paid to them in India. Mr. Bradlaugh did his best to stimulate the agitation, if such it could he called. But, in truth, it never was an agitation, in the proper sense. There was only an outburst of vanity and affectation. Mr. Talmokeen Ghose, who came over to England and, after stumping the country as a lecturer, became a candidate for an English constituency and was beaten, was a very fair specimen of an educated Bengali. Glib of tongue and unscrupulous of assertion, knowing well how to take advantage of the ignorance of the average Englishman about India, he made whining appeals to the British public on behalf of his highly-educated fellow countrymen. The modest demand of the Baboos was simply this, that they should be made rulers in the land. The request was accompanied by menaces of rebellion, and even by threats of invoking the aid of Russia. The proceedings at the Congress this year have been marked by a tone of subdued moderation. The Baboos have probably discerned the extreme folly of empty threats and vapourings. The Muhammadans have decided to have nothing more to do with the project of Home Rule. They know that as India was conquered by the sword, she will always be held "by the sword," and they are reconciled, on the whole, to British rule. At any rate, they prefer it very much to the rule of Hindoos. It seems to be probable that a fantastic absurdity, which some Englishmen hailed as a wise and noble project, is on the point of collapsing altogether.

The *Daily Graphic* (Conservative) of the following day was shorter, but was not any sweeter. It will be seen that the Conservative papers are determined not to be pleased with the Congress; strike high, strike low, they are still dissatisfied. The *Daily Graphic* says:

THE CALCUTTA CAUCUS.

With Lord Dufferin's trenchant denunciation of their dangerous tendencies evidently well in view, the members of the National Indian Congress, now in session in Calcutta, have been studiously restrained. This fact has, however, no bearing whatever on the merits of their movement. Were double the number of educated Indians to meet in council and to deliberate in a manner which would be a model to all the Parliaments in Europe, it would not afford any proof that the Parliamentary system is required in India, or that it would be good for the country. All it would show would be that a number of Indian gentlemen had imbibed English political ideas with their English education, and that they had outdone their teachers. To this extent, indeed, they differ from the mass of their countrymen, who have no English education and not the faintest glimmering of British ideas of constitutional government. It is always a dangerous plan to give representative institutions to people who are not ripe for them. If they fail to comprehend the powers surrendered to them they become tools in the hands of caucuses and election agents; if, on the other hand, they appreciate the value of their privileges, they force their delegates to champion the prejudices of their lower civilization. In India the electors would, for the most part, belong to the former category.

The *Daily Chronicle* (Liberal) on the 30th of December returned to the subject with a most sympathetic and wisely-conceived article. It pays a high compliment to the spirit in which the Congress proceedings were carried on. Referring to Mr. Caine, it points out that he moved that a petition be presented to the House of Commons, asking for the restoration of the right to bring forward Indian grievances for discussion before Mr. Speaker leaves the chair on the introduction of the Indian Budget, and adds:

"The debate on the Indian Budget itself is probably the most humiliating performance that even the House of Commons essays from beginning to end of the Session. The absence of Ministers, ex-Ministers and Members is noted in India, and its significance is pointedly discussed. To an Englishman it is disgraceful and criminal. How can it appear to a thoughtful and patriotic Indian? One natural consequence is, that the Minister has all but unchallenged scope to treat the interests of the Indian people—and it is high time that these were more clearly identified with the interests of our Indian Empire—in a shallow and supercilious manner, that inevitably rouses contempt and indignation in the minds of intelligent and earnest men. Parliament never does what it ought to do except under the stern compulsion of events; and it would almost seem as if it could not be brought to concede more than the merest perfunctory attention to Indian needs without the compulsion of some awful calamity. It is greatly to the credit of the Congress that it presses, with remarkable self-restraint and without violent or disrespectful language, for a reasonable opportunity of making the voice of India heard in the counsels of her rulers at Westminster. Mr. Caine's motion was received and carried with an enthusiasm that bears a vital significance."

We pass over a number of minor journals and come to the *Newcastle Daily Chronicle* (Unionist), a paper which seems to find pleasure in saying the most ill-natured and ill-conceived remarks respecting the Congress which are possible. An article in its issue of December 30 begins thus: "The reports coming to hand respecting the Native Congress now sitting in Calcutta,

go to show that the meeting is in point of attendance and in other respects, less successful than its predecessors. One reason for this is, doubtless, the presence in Calcutta of another Congress which has divided the public sympathies and interest. The second is a conference for the consideration of social reform in India, and particularly of reform as regards the marriage customs of the Hindus." Considering that the reports in its possession, on which, indeed, its article was founded, stated that six thousand people attended the political Congress, and only one thousand the social Congress, and further, that there was unanimity and enthusiasm at the former, and diversity of opinion at the latter, a grosser misrepresentation of facts is not possible. The article all through is of the same character. For example, the *Chronicle* says: "There are in India, 117 native states, to control which it is proposed to elect a Parliament." Thus it is that in England the blind among journalists lead the blind among the people.

The *Dundee Advertiser* (December 29: Liberal), as usual, writes with friendliness, and expresses wishes for the success of the reform movement.

Of course, the *Newcastle Journal* (December 29: Conservative) is hostile, but it writes in a spirit less offensive than that of many of its contemporaries on its side of politics. It is, however, altogether wrong in the view it takes of what England has done for India, as the following extracts show:

In physical well-being and in mental development the population has made vast strides under British rule. Progress, absolutely unknown in kind as well as in degree in any previous period of its history, has taken place in India that, without our incessant control, supervision, encouragement and fostering care would have been absolutely impossible. That is the great, broad, fundamental fact that is written right across the country, from the summit of the Himalayas to the shores of the Carnatic, from the wild paths trodden by our mountaineer native auxiliaries in the North-western passes to the immense areas of the Gangetic plain and the higher reaches of the Bramahpootra.

To insist, as some wild revolutionaries have not scrupled to do, that native talent has been kept down and kept out of all share in the sweets of office and power in India by British jealousy, rapacity and tyranny is a gross and inexcusable misrepresentation.

It is demonstrably true that the Indian Government, aided by the India Office, have done the very thing the *Journal*, unacquainted with the facts, denies they have done.

The *Bristol Mercury* (December 29: Liberal) is less cordial than it customarily is. It remarks:

Notwithstanding the sneers of Mr. Rudyard Kipling, the National movement in India has not disappeared. At the second meeting of the Congress a resolution was adopted petitioning the British Parliament to pass Mr Bradlaugh's Bill providing for the election of some of the Viceroy's legislative council. English people had better be cautious in forming an opinion either way on so difficult a question. While it would only be reasonable to grant at least the principle of representation to the many millions of Hindostan, if there seems to be a universal desire for it, the matter is complicated by the caste system, by the hopeless ignorance of the natives, and by their touchiness in regard to institutions introduced from abroad. The probability is that the semi-Anglicized baboos, the least reputable portion of the Indian community, will reap the whole benefit of the reform proposed.

The other Liberal daily paper in Bristol, the *Western Daily Press*, devotes a very long editorial to the movement which it entitles "Between Two Extremes." After a good deal of criticism more or less pertinent—less rather than more on the whole—the *Press* concludes thus:

The excessive claims advanced, not as a rule by, but for, the Congress, should not blind us to the great potential and actual value of a body competent to speak for four million natives of India, and representative undoubtedly of a class that is growing in numbers and influence. We may even regard the weak and halting Bill of Lord Cross last year for the reform of the Viceregal Council as a proof that the Congress is making its influence felt in unlikely quarters, and the discussion by the Congress of the current political questions of India has generally been marked by a sobriety and moderation that deserve the highest praise. If we may take the aims of the Congress from the words of its actual members rather than from the foolish fancies of English politicians who seem possessed with a blind prejudice against English rule, then all reason for suspicion and doubt vanish. We may take, for instance, Mr. Ghose on Friday. "The Congress only desired that its suggestions should be honestly and sympathetically answered and its expert aid freely used"; whilst Mr. Mehta, the president for the year, contended that the time had come, not for representative institutions, but for consultative councils. This is a reasonable request. The creation of such councils might be of the greatest assistance to the Government, and meanwhile the Congress itself is a valuable indication of an educated Indian opinion, even though at times it is weakened by the innate Indian reluctance to grapple with practical difficulties.

The *Star* (December 31: Radical) is perfectly satisfied with the proceedings as reported by telegram. The proceedings, it considers, reflect great credit upon those who took part in its deliberations. After discussing the Councils reform resolution, it says: "Surely there is nothing dangerous, nothing extreme in this! If ever the people of India are to be given a fuller voice in the election of their representatives a lesser concession can hardly be imagined. And yet it would seem that the Government of India view the Congress with repugnance and alarm. They knew beforehand what resolutions were to be submitted to it, and their commentary upon them was to issue a decree that no official should attend it, even as a spectator!" Later, it quotes Macaulay's noble words of 1833, and concludes:

Sixty years have passed since that speech was delivered, but the natives are still excluded from "high office," and when the unofficial representatives of the people intimate their intention to meet together to petition the Imperial Parliament that they may have some little say in the election of those who are to represent them in legislative councils, the Government are so horrified that they forbid their servants even to listen to the debates in which the justice of this demand is demonstrated. What if, in the time to come, the people of India demand, as they will, not the trumpery concession that would content but is denied them to-day, but European institutions? We say it would be the proudest day in English history. To have found a great people sunk in slavery and superstition, to have so ruled them as to have made them desirous and capable of all the privileges of citizens, would, as the great statesman whom we have already quoted told an assenting Senate in the year when Mr. Gladstone was returned for Newark, be a title to glory all our own.

The *Scottish Leader* (December 30: Liberal), after some very keen remarks on the Kipling criticism of the Congress, proceeds to say:

No less remarkable than before is the perfect orderliness and good sense with which the proceedings of the Congress are conducted, despite the admittedly abundant enthusiasm. And even more noteworthy than before is the combination of the different creeds for political action. The theory of a Mohammedan reaction may now be regarded as played out for practical purposes, a Mohammedan barrister being one of the conspicuous speakers. The very zeal with which the movement has been taken up has necessitated a closer population limit in the matter of delegates, as the number sent threatend to be overwhelming. But the movement as a whole grows alike in volume and solidity; and the absolutely new factor thus set up in Indian life, with its racial and religious divisions, may well develop social and political results equally unheard of in the East.

As was to be expected, the *South Wales Daily News* of Cardiff, (December 30: Liberal), which will be remembered by the delegates to Britain this year as being edited by Mr. Sonley Johnstone, who made a most excellent speech at the public meeting, at Cardiff, is hearty in its approval. Its article is headed "Quickened India." After discussing the Congress and its reasonable programme, the great South Wales Liberal Daily remarks:

It is gratifying to know that the British Committee of the Congress has entered upon the task of educating the British people upon the subject of Indian affairs. The task is an arduous one; but, proceeding concurrently with the action in India, there is hope of good results by-and-by. The disposition which the ruling class and its representatives at home evince to the movements is shown both by the Government order and by the misleading report in the *Times*; but the "classes" are losing their power, which is being transferred to "the masses," and these, having been educated to appreciation of value and importance of India, will not hesitate to sweep away abuses, and to remedy the maladministration of which Congress speakers complain. The real defence of India lies, not in scientific frontiers, but in the loyalty of the people; yet the Government wastes millions on military precautions, and sets at naught the wishes and the necessities of the people. Such an error will be productive of fatal consequences unless the National Congress succeeds in stirring public opinion to the point of insisting upon abandonment of the mischievous old policy; and, fortunately, there is hope that it will do this.

The *Leicester Daily Mercury* (December 31: Liberal) expresses warm approval of the determination to hold a Congress in London. "One of the best means of removing the want of information about India in the constituencies," says the *Mercury*, "is for Indians to come to England to plead their cause. We presume the conference will be held in London, but we trust the members will find opportunities to come into the great towns of the country and address popular audiences."

The *Leeds Daily News* (December 31: Conservative) is very contemptuous. We quote a few of its observations:

Institutions are of two kinds. They may be tools or toys. The Indian National Congress now sitting is of the second sort. It is a particularly strepitant rattle, which the more educated portion of the Hindoo populace has contrived to amuse itself with.

Young India, as it emerges from semi-barbarism, must talk. It does it in the National Congress, and its speech is wild, and ill-considered, and incoherent enough. It simply represents the first foolish outbursts of a tongue that has found its use for the first time.

The Indian Congress undoubtedly represents a section of native opinion when it clamours for the Almighty Franchise. But it is to be remembered that the section it represents is not representative. The educated Hindoos are a handful: the ignorant are the mass. It is absurd of the Congress to ask votes for all on the plea that there are a few elect.

Alone among the provincial Unionist papers the *Manchester Examiner* and the *Birmingham Daily Post* look upon the movement with a friendly eye. This evidence of good sense is so remarkable and unexpected, that we quote the whole of the *Examiner's* remarks. The *Examiner* says:

The New Year must find India considerably astonished by the proceedings of the National Congress, which has just closed its annual session. Its last act was to empower 100 delegates to proceed to England and hold a congress here, for the purpose of "proving to the British public the loyalty of the Indian people, and their fitness to be treated by them as fellow-citizens." The maintenance of caste distinctions might have been thought incompatible with the carrying out of such a mission, but as experts in the subject profess a different opinion, we can only say that the great majority of English people will be heartily glad to hear it, and to extend a cordial welcome to

their promised visitors. The recent Congress, like its predecessors, laboured under the twin disabilities of representing nobody except its own members, and being repudiated by leaders of the large Mahometan population of India. It also exposed itself to the charge of ignoring questions of practical, present interest, in order to devote itself to the discussion of more or less problematical considerations of the future, when it eschewed the "burning question" of infant marriage. Nevertheless, its resolutions evinced a moderation which will encourage those who see in these annual gatherings the germ of future capacity for self-government on the part of the great Hindoo race. The demand for a representative franchise, the scope of which is to be determined by the Viceroy, can hardly be said to threaten the security of British rule in India, and the debating power shown at the Congress shows that there are plenty of materials out of which a valuable native contingent of the Legislative Council could be formed, so as to give authoritative expression to native opinion on matters vitally affecting native interests. Some highly interesting and suggestive observations on this subject will be found in an article by Mr. W. S. Caine, which appears in another column. Neither can it be said that the call for a reduction of the Salt Tax is unreasonable. This impost presses with peculiar severity on a population which is never very far from the brink of starvation, and a Government profit of 2,500 per cent. on the manufacture of one of the necessaries of life is altogether contrary to modern notions of State economics. These Indian Congresses are ignored for the present by the Government—at least, officially—but their influence will have to be reckoned with all the same, and, however slow may be the development of Hindoo powers of self-government, the process deserves to be encouraged and assisted, as providing a solution for certain difficulties in the future.

The *Yorkshire Post's* London correspondent, on January 1, had another fling at the Baboos.

Mr. Caine is a Liverpool man, born and bred. That, no doubt, is why the *Liverpool Courier* (Conservative) in its leading article makes its remarks circle around Mr. Caine and his proceedings in India. This is the way in which it writes: "Mr. Caine finds ample compensation for all recent troubles and reverses, in the cheers and enthusiasm of the self-elected Congressmen. He has no English constituency for the present; but he has met hundreds of Indians, and since his patronage is found entirely agreeable to them, why should not Mr. Gladstone authorize his candidature for the next sure seat, and substitute Indian Home Rule for Irish as the central plank of the platform?" It, finally, dismisses the Congress with contempt in these terms:

There is no cause for British subjects to lie awake in bed thinking about the Indian Congress, its discussions, and its resolutions. The latter are not like the laws of the Medes and Persians, and if the former in any sense serve the purpose of blowing off steam, we can only be thankful that they are conducted with such rigid adherence to the rules of the most respectable of debating societies. It may be that the people of Great Britain do not know much about this Congress; but it is perfectly safe to say that the teeming millions of India know still less. There are no delegates in the true sense of the term, and therefore it is not surprising to hear that year by year the proceedings attract less and less of public interest. They are very nice, well-intentioned, and withal superior gentlemen who take part in the conclave—and possibly we should feel proud of them and their attainments—but it may well be that Lord Lansdowne is glad they are not India, that they do not represent India, and that in reality the country knows nothing of them.

The *Star* (Radical) is cordial in its good wishes for the success of the Congress. It joins in the condemnation of the Bengal Government for its circular forbidding the officials to have anything to do with the great organization which, evidently, it is beginning to fear.

Sir William Hunter's article in the *Times* has little to say about the Congress and a great deal about Mr. Bradlaugh's new Bill, which, on the whole, is approved.

The *Nottingham Evening Post* (Conservative) "at the risk of being looked on as illiberal and narrow-minded," does not approve of the Congress. It says:

The educated Baboo may be quite as fine a fellow as his admirers suppose, and he may make the most convincing speeches full of the noblest sentiments. But if we have ever to hold India against hostile attack, it will not be on the Baboo or his like that England will have to depend. We have not the slightest objection to social reform in India, or to political reform either, but we have a very strong opinion that such subjects can only be adequately dealt with by men who have had long experience in India, who know roughly the leading races in the Peninsula, and who know also to the full the danger of indiscreet meddling. The fierce and warlike Mahomedan tribes would not submit to be ruled by the "mild Hindoo," let him speak and write ever so nicely, and indeed the two would be more likely to enact anew the procedure of the famous Kilkenny cats than bring about in concert a social and political millennium. The common sense of the matter is that those who know India, and understand, or are at least in a position to understand, Indian problems, should rule India. We cannot, without peril, listen to "congresses" on which half of the native populace look with contempt and dislike. Still less can we safely allow Indian affairs to become counters in the political game played in Great Britain.

"The fierce and warlike Muhammadan tribes" is good, considering that nearly all the Muhammadans in India, Sir Syed Ahmed Khan among them, are converted Hindus, who live amicably with their neighbours and have no intention of quarrelling with them.

Among the weekly papers the *Graphic* (Conservative) remarks:

There are, however, other matters to which educated natives might address themselves with the greatest advantage to their country. Infant marriages, and even that iniquitous impost the Salt Duty, are quite trivial blemishes compared with the contempt in which the educated natives hold physical toil. Their one idea of advancement in life is to get into Government employ, and to stick there for the rest of their narrow lives. Could not the Congress do something to eradicate that vicious notion? There are not a few Indian industries now in a semi-moribund condition, which need only brains, energy, and capital to resume their ancient prosperity. Similarly, if the Vedas may be believed, maritime commence was much in vogue among the Indian people in the long ago. Nor are there wanting remunerative openings in argriculture for trained skill. Here, then, is an ample social domain for the Congress wallahs to cultivate, and, judging from the present meeting, they seem disposed to turn in that direction.

If the writer knew as much of India as he professes, he would know very well that the foreigner has not only crowded the native out of the Civil Service, but out of commercial pre-eminence and competition also.

The *Spectator* (Unionist) is most inaccurate and unfair. "The main object of the Congress now," it says, "is to enlarge the Legislative Councils *so as to give natives a majority*, and to introduce an elective element." After that, it does not matter what the *Spectator* says.

With what some of the weekly religious papers say we must end this catena of editorial opinions. As one reads many of the observations made in this Indian movement, one considers what Carlyle was about to speak so often of the "able" editor. This is especially true of what *John Bull* says. That paper—the organ of Tory High Churchmen—would soon settle the Congress-wallas. As witness these observations:

We have never been able to share the view that seems to prevail in not a few quarters—held notably by the *Times*—that the proceedings of the Annual Indian Congress can be safely treated with contempt. To us it seems a most dangerous institution. Of course everybody knows that a great deal of nonsense is talked at the Congress. There is no such entity as the nation of India: you might as well talk of the nation of Europe. And the projects discussed are visionary and unpractical. But nonsense is none the less mischievous because it is nonsense. The Indian Congress veils a seditious movement against British rule, just as the Irish Nationalist agitation is a conspiracy against the British Crown. The members of the Congress have not been elected by the people at large. But they come from all parts; they can stir up disaffection all over India; and the Congress every year acquires more importance from being bolstered up by English Radicals and Revolutionists. It is evident that these latter see in it a fruitful source of future mischief. If it were not so, they would not have lent it their patronage. They want to ruin the Empire, and they think they can promote that object by undermining British authority in India.

The attitude of the Nonconformist papers may be fairly judged by this passage from the *Christian Million*:

The extreme moderation of these views contrasts forcibly with the panic dread that seems to be felt by the authorities. Official Anglo-Indians view the native Congress much as a movement towards representative institutions would be viewed in Russia or Turkey. Unquestionably, there are two modes of thought regarding India prevalent in Britain. The first regards India as a subject province, an immense human machine for tribute-paying. The Indian races, according to these notions, were created in order to provide judgeships, controllerships and other overpaid official posts for the sons of English and Scotch conquerors. The opium-sellers and drink-traffickers, against whom Mr. Caine has taken up his parable, are typical examples of this class. On the other hand stands the English democracy holding out to dusky Hindoos the motto, "India for Indians." If the latter opinion prevails and uproots the former, we shall see rapid advance and improvement in the condition of the Hindoo. A fair opening will first of all be secured for all qualified inhabitants of India into the service of the State and thus an intolerable load of taxation be done away with. Nothing else will remove the temptation for having recourse to such financial expedients as opium-selling and the drink-traffic. Next in order will come municipal institutions, with a revival of those ancient Indian communal rights out of which all the freedom of modern Europe has historically sprung. In a State principally administered by native officials and where municipal institutions have taken root and flourished, parliamentary representation and legislative rights cannot long be withheld from the people. We may not live to see that day, but when it shall dawn, as we believe it will, and an Imperial Indian parliament at Delhi or Calcutta shall make laws for Hindostan, a glory will be added to the English name brighter and more enduring than military fame. We see the dawn of it already in the Indian National Congress.

As a final word on the matter we give the parting kick of Mr. Macgregor, the Calcutta correspondent of the *Times*, which appears in his telegram of the 4th instant:

The Anglo-Indian Press has taken little notice of the recent meeting of the National Congress. The *Times of India* describes it as a complete *fiasco*, adding that the Parsees, like the Mahomedans, again held aloof, and even the Bengali Baboos were too lukewarm to fill the seats at their disposal. Most of the other papers express similar views. On the other hand, the section of the native Press which supports the movement pronounces the sixth Congress a magnificent success. The *Indian Mirror* sums up its most remarkable features thus:—

First, the presence on the platform of Mr. Schwann, M.P. for North Manchester; second, the election as delegates of two Englishmen—Mr. Caine and Mr. Yule; third, the fact that a native lady delegate spoke for the first time; fourth, the resolution to hold the meeting of 1892 in London. The *Mirror* considers this resolution the most important that has hitherto been passed by the Congress.

THE TERM "BABU" AS USED IN INDIA AND IN ENGLAND.

To the Editor of "INDIA."

SIR,—Words can hardly express the gratitude we owe you for your earnest advocacy of the claims of the Indians, and your indefatigable efforts in our cause. Sincere friend as you are, you try to raise the status of the people of India as a nation. And it is in this connection that I wish to address you a few lines, which I hope will meet with your approval. You will be glad to hear that many in India fully appreciate the spirit which actuated you to try to eliminate the terms "Native" and "Babu," used in derision by a large section of the Anglo-Indians. The term "Indian" is being used instead of "Native" by many, at your instance. No successful attempt has yet been made to substitute "Mr." in lieu of "Babu," which every subordinate under an Anglo-Indian knows, is used in any but a respectful sense. If the term "Native" as defined in the "Statute" has a redeeming feature, the term "Babu" has none. "Babu" has no historical basis; nor is it found in any ancient work or in any vernacular lexicon. Probably the term "Babu" has come to be used from the time of Muhammadan rule in Bengal, when it was used in an honorific sense as *Babu Shabeb*, as used even at present in some parts of India. The word *Bibi* seems to be its feminine. If it is difficult to do away with the use of "Babu" in Bengali language, where it is conjointly used with the word *Srijut*, which adds to its respectability, we can at all events shun its use in English language. Even in vernacular it is hardly used in a very respectful sense. No Bengali, son or nephew, ever addressed his father or uncle or superiors as "Babu," but always writes *Srijut* only. Lately a largely circulated Bengali journal has begun to use "Babu" in a ridiculous sense. In the Congress literature the term "Babu" is seldom used by its supporters. Specially in the National Congress Report book the term "Babu" is never used, but "Mr." is always reasonably substituted for it. Every one who has ever been in Bombay or Madras presidency knows that "Babu" is never prefixed to the proper name of a Parsi, Mahratta, Tartul, or Tebgu gentleman. Nor the terms "Sett," "Shabeb," etc., used in English which is used in vernacular by their respective community. Then with what show of reason the term "Babu" is transplanted in English language? "Babu" is not only being used by the Anglo-Indian press as a term of ridicule, but a large number of Jingo papers in England have begun to use it sneeringly with a vengeance. This term not only differentiates Europeans from Indians, but creates a gulf between the Bengalis and other races of India—nay, it makes distinction between the Bengalis themselves, as distinguished from those visiting Europe, for before the name of such gentlemen "Mr." is invariably used, and not "Babu." It will be apparent to every right-thinking person, that the term "Mr." should be adopted instead of "Babu" when using the English language. Why retain only *Babu*, leaving aside *Srijut*? specially as the feminine term "Sm." (contraction of *Srimati*), of *Srijut* is in vogue even in legal documents It is very reasonable that since "Sm." is always used before the names of females, so should "Sj." be used, *a fortiori*, before all masculine names. I beg to subjoin a grammatical declension or inflection of these terms, which will at once bring home to the minds of your readers the feasibility of adopting "Sj." instead of "Babu" if they at all care to retain any Indian prefix. Moreover, *Srijut* being a Sanskrit word "Sj." may be used before the names of any Hindu, of whatever province he may belong. Then again in vernacular the practice is always to prefix "Sri." in signing one's name. This has been dispensed with in English, not being practicable. So, for convenience sake also, it is highly desirable that we should give up the use of the term "Babu" and adopt uniformly "Mr." in English, which will avoid, the invidious distinction now observed.

As the credit of introducing the term "Indian" in lieu of "Native" is due to you, let us hope the honour of substituting "Mr." in place of "Babu" is also reserved for you. I am sure if you once take the initiative many will follow *de bonne grâce*.

GRAMMATICAL INFLECTION.

First Gender.

Males.	Females.
Mr.=" Sj." (Srijut).	Mrs.=" Sm." (Srimati).
Master=" Kr." (Kumar). (Bachelor).	Miss=" Ki." (Kumari). (Spinster).

Second Number.

Single.	Plural.
Mr.=" Sj."	Messrs.=" Sjs."
Mrs.=" Sm."	Mesdames=" Sms."
Bachelor=" Kr."	Bachelors=" Krs."
Miss=" Ki."	Misses=" Kis."

Yours, etc.,

SATISCHANDRA GHOSH.

Dacca, 15th December, 1890.

SAVE YOUR BOOTS AND HARNESS.

DALES' GOLD MEDAL DUBBIN

Makes Boots and Harness and all leather goods Waterproof as a duck's back and soft as velvet. Puts NEW LIFE into the Leather, whether lost by wear, climatic heat, or saturation of water, and if occasionally applied will add three times to its wear. Allows a fine polish after application. Supplied in yellow or in black tins.

Awarded more Gold Medals for superiority than all other Dubbins combined.

J. T. DALES,
EAST DULWICH, LONDON, S.E.

Can be Indented through HUTCHINSON & Co., or any of the leading Export Houses.

A Most Suitable Present for the Young.

THE YEARLY VOLUME OF

SPRINGTIDE,

NOW READY,

PRICE 2s. 6d., or Rs. 2,

With Postage to India.

Handsomely Bound in Cloth, with Gilt Edges.

PUBLISHERS:

For the United Kingdom:
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.

For India and the Colonies:
M. H. ABDUL-ALI, 5, Bedford Row, London, W.C.

NOTE.—Our First and Choice Edition being limited in number, will the Subscribers kindly send in their Orders as early as possible, either through their bookseller or direct to the Publishers.

THE LARGEST AND PUREST HOMŒOPATHIC ESTABLISHMENT IN THE EAST.

LAHIRI & CO.,

Wholesale and Retail HOMŒOPATHIC CHEMISTS AND DRUGGISTS,

101, COLLEGE STREET, CALCUTTA.

BRANCH PHARMACIES: (1) SOVABAZAR; (2) BANKIPORE; (3) PATNA CITY.

Have the largest stock of Homœopathic Medicines, Books, and Sundries imported regularly from ENGLAND, AMERICA and GERMANY.

Catalogues and Price List free by post.

LAHIRI, RAY & CO., PERFUMERS,

103, COLLEGE STREET, CALCUTTA.

WE are glad to inform the public that within the short period of our existence we have been favored with patronage from Maharajas, Rajahs, Zemindars, Noblemen, and gentlemen throughout India. We guarantee the best quality and genuineness of our articles, which are prepared under our own supervision.

NOVELTIES IN PERFUMERY.

Attar of Patchouly, per tola .. .. .. Rs. 2
Attar of Lemon Flowers, per tola 3
Attar of Kaora, per tola .. Rs. 2 and Rs. 2-8
Attar of Juin, per tola 2
Attar of Hena, per tola, Rs. 1-8, Rs. 3, Rs. 4 and 5.

CATALOGUE AND PRICE LIST FREE ON APPLICATION.

HUTCHINSON & Co.

Merchants, Bankers, and Agents,
25, CRAVEN ST., CHARING CROSS,
LONDON.

CONSIGNMENTS received, realized, and promptly remitted for.
INDENTS and purchases of every description made and forwarded at lowest rates.
PASSENGERS by the P. & O., Orient, British India, and other Lines met by own officials, to take charge of Baggage, clear and deliver it, and otherwise assist Passengers.
CUSTOMS and General Agency. Bills of Lading attended to. Goods cleared at Customs and delivered in any part of United Kingdom, warehoused and otherwise dealt with as instructed.
ARMY, Navy, and Civil Pay and Pensions realized.
TELEGRAPHIC Remittances of Money to Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras made.
ORDERS on the London Stock Exchange executed.
DEPOSITS at Interest for Fixed Periods and open Current Accounts for the convenience of Constituents in England and India.
STORAGE and Insurance. Agents for the Sun Life and Fire Insurance Company.
INFORMATION promptly furnished. Moneys recovered. Letters carefully considered and answered.

The Representatives of Messrs. HUTCHINSON & Co. board Steamers from the East on their arrival at Gravesend or at the Docks, to take instructions for Clearing and Forwarding Baggage, &c.

Mr. AZIZ AHMAD,

FROM LUCKNOW,
TEACHER OF ARABIC, PERSIAN, HINDUSTANI, &c.
Lecturer on Egypt, Afghanistan, India, &c.
ADDRESS:
36, BANK STREET, HILLHEAD, GLASGOW.

W. B. DALE,

(LATE STAUNTON),
Stationers and Printers,
Account Book Manufacturers.

ENGRAVING, DIE-SINKING, RELIEF STAMPING, and ILLUMINATING

28a, VILLIERS STREET, STRAND, W.C., LONDON,
East side of Charing Cross (S.E.R.) Station.

PRINTING.

A. BONNER,
34, BOUVERIE ST., LONDON, E.C.

NEWSPAPERS, MAGAZINES, LEAFLETS, Pamphlets, Books, &c.

Commercial, Professional, AND General Printing.

GOOD STYLE AND QUALITY.

THE
BELT DRAWERS.
A SPECIALITE IN GENTLEMEN'S UNDERCLOTHING.

The article is formed on a principle that affords to the wearer a nice, gentle, and uniform support to the loins, abdomen, etc., imparting therewith a sense of remarkable comfort, as also a pronounced healthful influence.

Moderate price and excessive durability, rendering the article an economical garment withal.

Makers and Originators of the Article,
SANDLAND & CRANE
Gentlemen's Hosiers,
55, Regent St., London.
(The Quadrant section of the street, and next to Swan and Edgar's.)
Illustrated Prospectus and Price List on Application.

MRS. S. ASSER,
Milliner and Ladies' Outfitter,

The GRECIAN and other TEA GOWNS, in Pongee, Nun's Veiling, etc. from 3 Guineas.
Silk and Gauze UNDERCLOTHING. Charming GUINEA HATS and BONNETS.
A Useful Present. Suitable for Valentines.

Pansy Shaded, raised surface, 18/9.

GRECIAN BANDS
for young ladies' evening wear in Gilt, Silver, or tiny Flowers, from 3/9.

A BODICE TRIMMING
in Ostrich and Aigrette Feathers and Butterflies, 30/- per set.

OSTRICH FANS
from 65/-, also in Crepe from 10/9, to match any Costume.

Any of the above carefully packed and sent per parcel post on receipt of Cheque or P.O.O.

On Crepe, outlined with Spangles, 15/9.

To ensure immediate attention, a Cheque or London TRADE Reference must accompany all Orders.

8 & 9, Burlington Arcade, London, W.

W. A. STIMSON,
MILITARY AND DIPLOMATIC TAILOR.

INDIAN OUTFITS.

52, MADDOX STREET,
NEW BOND STREET,
LONDON, W.

WILCOX, WOODROW & Co.
Tailors and Outfitters,
20, PRINCES STREET, HANOVER SQUARE,
LONDON.

JAMES BRANCH & SONS,
SOLE MANUFACTURERS OF THE CELEBRATED
"BECTIVE" Boots and Shoes, and of The "EL DORADO" Lawn Tennis Shoes.
19, 21, 23, BETHNAL GREEN ROAD, LONDON, E.,
AND AT
ARTIZAN ROAD, NORTHAMPTON.

These goods may be obtained of all the leading Bootmakers in every important town in the United Kingdom, South Africa, and the Australian Colonies.
See *The Queen*, October, 1883, and November, 1888; *The Court Journal*, June 16th, 1883; *The Court Circular*, June 16th, 1883; *The Sanitary Record*, June 15th, 1883.

HIGHEST AWARD,
INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION.
LONDON 1884.

REPRESENTATIVES REQUIRED FOR INDIA.

MIRACLE.
DR. W. C. ROY'S
SPECIFIC FOR INSANITY.
Numerous Testimonials.

SOLD at No. 25, PROSUNNO CUMAR TAGORE'S STREET, CALCUTTA. Price Rs. 5 per phial. Rupee 1, in addition for postage and package.

U. N. BAGCHI, M.A.,
MANUFACTURING CHEMIST.

HINDU TOURISTS' PARTY
TO EUROPE, AMERICA, CHINA, JAPAN AND THE STRAITS.

HINDU Noblemen and Gentlemen desirous of proceeding to England or any other parts of Europe, to America, or to China, Japan, and the Straits, in the Hindu style, will please communicate with, and send in their names for registration to, the undersigned.

CHARU CHUNDER MITTER
(Of Allahabad and Calcutta),
Care of the Editor, *Indian Mirror*,
74, DHURRUMTOLLAH STREET,
CALCUTTA.

Printed by A. BONNER, 34, Bouverie Street, Fleet Street, London, E.C. and Published by WM. DIGBY, 25, Craven Street, Charing Cross, W.C.